

A N
ADDRESS

To those of the
Roman Communion

I N
ENGLAND:

Occasioned by the late
Act of Parliament,
For the further Preventing
the Growth of Popery.

L O N D O N,
Printed for *Mat. Wotton*, at the *Three
Daggers* near the *Inner-Temple-gate*
in *Fleetstreet*. 1700.

BOOKS Printed for *Matt. Wotten,*

The Second Volume of the Remains of the most Reverend Father in God, and Blessed Martyr *William Laud*, Lord Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*. Written by himself. Collected by the Late Learned M^r *Henry Wharton*, and Published According to his Request, by the Reverend Mr. *Edmund Wharton* his Father.

Occasional Paper, N^o 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

Anglia Notitia, Or the present State of *England*, with divers Remarks upon the Ancient State thereof; by *Edward Chamberlayne* Doctor of Laws. The Ninth Edition with Great Additions and Improvements. In Three parts.

Remarks upon an Essay concerning Humane Understanding, in a Letter Addressed to the Author. N^o 1, 2, 3.

The History of the Revolution of *Portugal* in the Year 1640. Or an Account of their Revolt from *Spain*; and Setting the Crown on the Heads of *Don John of Braganza*, Father to *Don Pedro* the present King, and *Catherine* the Queen Dowager of *England*.

Echard's Roman History First and Second Part. *Charone* of Wisdom, in Three Books. Englished by *George Stanhope*, D. D.

Farnaby's Rhetorik.

English Gardiner.

BOOKS Printed for Matthew Wotton, at the Three Daggers in Fleetstreet.

A *Guide to the Devout Christian.* In Three Parts. The First containing Meditations and Prayers affixed to the days of the Week; Together with many Occasional Prayers for particular Persons. The Second for more Persons than one, or a whole Family, for every day of the Week; Together with many Occasional Prayers. The Third containing a Discourse of the Nature and Necessity of the Holy Sacrament; Together with Meditations thereon, Prayers and Directions for the worthy Receiving thereof. To which is Added. A Prayer for *Ash-Wednesday*, or any other time in *Lent*; for *Good-Friday*, and any Day of Publick Fasting: By *John Inest*, M. A. Chanter of the Cathedral Church of *Lincoln*. The Fourth Edition Corrected.

A Guide to Repentance, or the Character and Behaviour of the devout Christian in Retirement; By *John Inest*, Chanter of the Cathedral Church at *Lincoln*.

The Christians Pattern, or a Treatise of the Imitation of Jesus Christ, in Four Books with Cutts, written originally in *Latin*, by *Thomas à Kempis*, now rendered into *English*. To which are added Meditations and Prayers for sick Persons; By *George Stanhope*, D. D. Chaplain in ordinary to his Majesty. Price 5s. The same Book is Printed in a smaller Letter and sold for 2s.

Salvation every Man's great Concern, written originally in *French*, by *Monsieur Apin*, done into *English*.

Books Printed for *Mat. Wotton.*

An earnest Invitation to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, wherein all the Excuses that Men ordinarily make for their not coming to the Holy Communion, are Answered, by *Jos. Glanvil* late Minister of *Bath*.

A Defence of the 39 Articles of the Church of *England*, written in Latin by *J. Ellis* S. T. D. now done into English. To which are added the *Lambeth* Articles, together with the Judgment of Bp. *Andrews*, Dr. *Overal*, and other Eminent and Learned Men upon them.

Twelve Sermons preached upon several Occasions; By the Right Reverend Father in God, *Richard*, Lord Bp. of *Bath and Wells*.

—His 2d. and 3d. Parts of the Demonstration of the Messias, in which the Truth of the Christian Religion is Defended; especially, against the *Jews*.

Dr. Stanhope's Sermon at the Funeral of *Dr. Tower*son.

—His Sermon preached at the Annual Meeting of the Sons of the Clergy.

The Heinousness of Injustice. A Sermon preached at the Assizes at *Lincoln*; by *Lawrence Echard*, A. M.

Mr. Bradford's Sermon preached before the King. *Jan.* 30th.

Mr. Hole's Visitation Sermon at *Bridgwater*.

Dr. Barton's Sermon to the Societies for Reformation of Manners.

The Character of the True Church, in a Sermon Preach'd at the French Church in the *Sawy*, upon these Words, *How goodly are thy Tents O Jacob, and thy Tabernacles O Israel*, Numb. 24. ver. 5. by *A. D. Astor de Laussac*, formerly a Prior and Arch-Deacon of the Church of *Rome*.

The

THE CONTENTS.

THE *Design of this Address,*
Page 1.

*Why those of the Roman Commu-
nion have not Reason to expect
the same Toleration with other
Dissenters,* p. 4.

*Reasons to persuade those of the
Church of Rome to examine the
Grounds of their Religion.* p. 15.

*Of the Infallibility of the Church of
Rome.* p. 25.

Of Transubstantiation. p. 54.

*Of the Idolatry of the Church of
Rome.* p. 95.

Of the Popes Supremacy p. 127.

ERRATA.

PAge 10 in Marg. after Vid. ad 4 Gen. p. 13.
line 10. for they, read *the Romanists*, p.
27. l. 11. f. it r. *is*. p. 28. l. 16. f. differs r. *dis-*
fer. p. 32. l. 14. f. pretences r. *pretenders*. p. 35.
l. 15. f. thing and lies r. *things and lie*. p. 37. l.
9. f. terms r. *forms*. p. 38. l. 9. after Now r. *our*
Saviour. p. 60. l. 21. f. blessings r. *blessing*. p. 117.
l. 16. f. Scripture r. *Scriptures* and *dele add*. p.
126. l. 5. f. those r. *these*. p. 141. l. penult. f.
Person r. *Persons*. p. 143. l. 1. after and r. *the*.

A N
ADDRESS

To those of the
Roman Communion

I N
ENGLAND.

THE Design of this Address is not by any means to insult over you; in the Circumstances under which it has pleased God in his Providence to bring you; or to raise popular Odium against you. No, however necessary I may judge

B

that

that which has lately been done, yet I cannot but have a great compassion for any thing that looks like Suffering for Conscience sake. And this, I think, I owe not only to the Principles of Humane Nature, which require that we should have a tenderness and pity for those that are in Affliction; but to the Principles of my Religion, as a Christian and a Member of the Church of *England*. I have always looked upon it as one of the Glories of the Protestant Religion, that it gives the dominion over Mens Consciences to God only; that it asserts the natural Liberty of Mankind to judge for themselves what it is that God expects from them; that it makes very charitable Allowances for the Ignorance and Mistakes of Men when joined with Sincerity and a true Love of God; and that in
con-

consequence of these things it does not incline it's Members to a severe inquisition into the private Opinions of Men, or to be hard upon them upon that account. And on the other side, that it has been a great aggravation of the Errors of the Church of *Rome*, that the Belief of them has been so rigidly exacted, under no less pain than *Damnation* in the other World, and the being *Burnt*, or at least *Undone* in this, whenever it has been in their power to effect it.

But you will say perhaps, That if the Opinion of Protestants be so much against Persecution, how comes it to pass that there have been so many severe Laws from time to time made against you; especially *this last*, which deprives your Children of their Inheritance, if they will not renounce their Religion;

and deprives you of the comfort and assistance of your Spiritual Fathers by forbidding them to Exercise any Office of their Function under pain of lying in a Goal all their Lives if they are caught?

Now in answer to this, I would not aggravate Matters to make you odious; but as plainly, and as tenderly as I can, lay the Reasons before you which, we may suppose, the Nation went upon in making these Laws, in some hopes to alleviate that Exasperation which your present Sufferings may cause, and which may very likely make you throw away, without considering, all that a Protestant can say for your Conviction.

Why those
of the *Roman*

And First, I desire
Communion have not reason to expect the
same Toleration with other Dissenters.

you

you would consider that there must be some peculiar Reason of this dealing with you under a *Prince*, and in a *Nation* so much inclined to Liberty of Conscience in almost every Body else. We have indeed, a very ill Opinion of your Errors, and the danger of them to the Souls of Men; and of the dishonour brought to God by giving to Creatures the Worship due only to him. But besides these, there are some things peculiar in your Religion which give Protestants just grounds of Jealousie, and make your Case very different from that of other Parties who dissent from the National Establishment.

The first is this, That you own a Dependence upon a Foreign Power, and a Power which is a
B 3 declared

declared Enemy to all Protestants. You own for the Vicar of Jesus Christ, and the Head of your Church, a Person who pretends to a Power to Depose Princes, and to give away their Dominions to such of your Church as are able to get them; and who in fact has very frequently Exercised this Power, and by it caused great Bloodshed and Disturbances in the World. Particularly, he has by Name Excommunicated Two of our own Princes, *Henry VIII.* and Queen *Elizabeth*; and has forbid all their Subjects to obey, or assist them, and has given away their Country to any Invader that would come and take it. And he does the same in effect,

* The form of all these Bulls may be seen in *Bullar. Roman.*

every Year in the famous * *Bulla Cæne* by our King and Government at present.

You

You cannot wonder if Protestants are desirous at least to disarm all those who own this Man for the Vicar of Jesus Christ. And this in fact was the Cause of most of those severe Laws which have been made against you. In the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's days the Papists generally lived as easie and quiet as other Subjects; but when the Pope *Excommunicated* the Queen, and Priests were sent from the Seminaries abroad to alienate the Hearts of Her Subjects, and Conspiracies were entred into against her; then were those severe Laws made as against those that were Enemies to the State.

It is very well known how many Conspiracies followed that Excommunication through the whole

course of her Reign, and what danger the Nation was in from the *Spanish* Invasion, which was undertaken upon the instigation of Romish Priests, and upon the Title which the Pope gave the King of *Spain* to the Kingdom of *England*.

But I shall not insist upon these things, or the many Provocations we have had ever since to this day; or the great danger we may be in at present; so far I believe must appear reasonable to all indifferent Persons, that it is fit for us to make all those who expect to enjoy the Privileges of other Subjects to renounce an Authority so dangerous to us.

It may, perhaps, be said that there are some among you who do not own the Pope to have such Authority,

rity, and that therefore we may safely deal more gently with them.

As to this, I shall not insist at present to shew how far this Power of the Popes to Excommunicate and deprive Heretical Princes and States is a Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*; this is certain, that it has been long pretended to by the Head of that Church; and those who do not approve of it ought, to speak out, and to renounce Communion with him as a Tyrant, and an Usurper, and a Heretick by pretending such Power from Jesus Christ which was never given him: But so long as they stick by him, and own him for the Head of their Church, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ, for the Judge of Controversies, and the Supreme director of their Consciences, they must not wonder if Protestants can

B 5 have

have no Confidence in them ; especially if we consider how many Methods of Deceit have been taught and recommended by those among them, who have been, and are still the great Guides of Consciences.

The 2d Consideration I would propose is this, That Protestants have a Right by the Principle of Self-Preservation to take such Methods with those of the Roman Communion, as may put it out of their power to do

* Vid. Concil.
Lat. Can. 3. de
Hæreticis, which
is called a General
council by
that of *Constant*
Sess. 19. and by
that of *Trent*.
Sess. 24.

them a mischief ;
* because Papists are
obliged by the Laws
of their Religion to
persecute Protestants ;
and these are Laws
that have been as
much put in Execution when e-
ver it has been in their power,
and

and it could be done with safety, as any Laws they have.

It would be thought too invidious to reckon up all the Wars and Massacres, Burnings and Cruelties of all sorts that have been and are still in the World upon this account; especially what has been done in a manner under our view in a Neighbour Country, the sad effects of which not only our selves but all the Protestant Countries in *Europe* see and feel, by those vast Numbers of poor Creatures that flock to us to preserve their Consciences and beg their Bread: Only thus far we cannot forbear to take Notice, that there have been more hard things suffered for not submitting to the Pope than ever were inflicted upon Christians for their Religion by all the Heathen Persecutors together.

Were

Were these things the effects only of suddain Passion, or Faction of State, which often do hard things to one another; there might be however some hope left that it might be otherwise, should we ever again come into their power: But when Men are cruel upon a steady settled Principle of Persecution, there is nothing left but to guard our selves against them as well as we can. Not that we may lawfully do hard things to them because they have done so to us, or our Brethren; for that would be Revenge, or at best the imitating a very bad Example: But every Man has by nature a Right to defend himself, and if that makes it wise or necessary for him to do some things which otherwise he has no Inclination to, it is not his fault, but the fault of those who bring that necessity upon him.

We

We are convinced that if Popery should prevail in *England*, we should not long enjoy our Estates, or perhaps Lives, if we would not comply with it; and we are sensible, that more than once we have been in great danger of this; especially lately, when it was almost a Miracle that we were saved from it. We are sensible also that they are a restless uneasy Party; that they have mighty dependencies abroad which have much prevailed of late; that we can't tell what Foreign Power may be invited over, or in succeeding times what encouragement they may have at home; and therefore we do conceive that meerly in our own defence we may justly take as effectual measures as we can to keep their Priests from among them, who we are satisfied have been and are
like

like to be *Incendiaries* ; and to divert their *Estates* into better Hands of their own *Relations*, that they may not be turned against us. To conclude this matter ; notwithstanding these Reasons, we have to guard our selves against Popery, yet there are here no Cruelties of an *Inquisition*, no *Burning*, no taking away of *Life* , no *Dragooning* ; nay, the greatest part, the Traders, and those of the poorer sort are scarce touched in this Act ; and as for others on whom it is hardest, those of *Estates*, yet there is nothing done of a sudden and irremediable ; there's Time allowed for Consideration, and Place left for Repentance and better Thoughts ; and in the mean time their Persons are secure, and they are at Liberty to go into any other Country with all the Money and Goods they can get, without danger of
being

being sent to the Gallies, if they are caught ; which are Privileges a great many poor Creatures we have lately heard of would take to be very great Mercies.

As far as a private Man may venture to give his Opinion of the Actions of his Superiors, these I suppose (joyned with some peculiar Insolencies at this time, very well known in the Kingdom) were the chief Reasons the King and Parliament went upon in making this and former Laws against you ; and if our Religion be true and yours false, I believe you your selves will hardly condemn us for it. And this is the *next thing* I would desire you to consider of ; that you would not take it for granted, that

Reasons to persuade those of the Church of Rome to examine the grounds of their Religion.

that you are in the right, and so call this Persecution for Conscience sake, but that you would take this Opportunity to examin the grounds of your Religion; which will be an advantage to you which way so ever the matter end.

If upon Examination you find your selves to have been in the wrong, you will then have the Benefit and Comfort of being converted from very dangerous Errors and Practices, and of living quietly, and preserving your Estates to your Families; but if otherwise, you find reason for your present Opinions, it will be a mighty comfort to you in whatever you suffer, that you do it upon evidence and conviction of Conscience; and not upon Fancy and Prejudice from your Education.

And

And so much, I think, in Justice you owe to your Children, not to Breed them up in a Religion which must deprive them of their Estates, till you have well examined the Truth of it your selves: It will indeed be the greatest Blessing to them to Breed them up in the true Religion let the consequences as to this World be what they will; but at least, Matters ought to be well weighed before you do what will be on all accounts so great an Injury to them, if your Religion should prove false, which perhaps, I may give you just reason to suspect before I conclude this Paper, if you will but read it without prejudice and partiality. Only one thing I would desire you to have a care of, that you be not too nicely sensible of the *disbounour* of changing your Opinion, now it
may

may seem to be for your Interest. This I know is a Consideration apt to work very strong, and to give a greater Bias to the Minds of some Persons than the greatest Interest in the World. But a good Christian should be contented with the Apostle to go *through evil report and good report*, and should despise the Censure of the World, so he can but please God and save his Soul.

And this suggests *another Consideration*, that not only your Interest in this World, but your Souls are very much concerned in this Examination. Your Church is accused by Protestants as guilty of a great number of dangerous Errors, and of very sinful Practices; of Superstition and Idolatry, of being the Authors, and consequently having the guilt of a great Schism in the Church; and it concerns you
to

to consider whether this Charge be true, or no? Whatever Charity Protestants may have for those among you, who have no means of being better Informed, they have just reason to look upon such Errors and sinful Practices as like to be fatal to those among you who might be better informed and will not.

But there is *another Consideration*, which perhaps may weigh more with you in this Matter than the Opinion of Protestants; which is, That if this Charge against you be true; if you are guilty of Schism and Idolatry, and such gross Errors, by the Opinion of your own Divines, you cannot be Saved. This is a Matter that they themselves often urge against that Charity which Protestants are apt to have for sincere honest People among

mong you that are invincibly Ignorant; besides, the very same Reasons which they urge to shew the danger that we are in, do equally hold against you, supposing that you are in the wrong. If it be *Heresy* in us to deny the Articles of your *new Creed*, supposing they are true, it must be *Heresy* in you to believe them, supposing they are false; the Reason is the same in both; and so as to the *Schism*, if your pretended Head of the Church be guilty of Tyranny, and Usurpation, and Heresy and Idolatry, and of imposing these upon Christians, it is He and his Followers are in the *Schism*, and not We. And then, all those dreadful things which your own Writers say against *Schism* and *Heresy*, do as much belong to you, supposing you are in the wrong; as they do to us if we are so. And therefore
if

if what they say, have any weight with you, it ought to make you consider seriously whether you are in the right, or no.

I the rather urge this, because it contains a full Answer to that piece of Sophistry wherewith you often deceive your selves, and endeavour to delude us; *That you are safe by the confession of all Sides, but we are not, and that therefore we ought in prudence to come over unto you.* Which is false; for by your own Opinion you are not safe, but in a Damnable Condition, supposing that you are in the wrong: There is no difference at all betwixt us and you in this Matter; except only where the Truth lies. For if our charitable Opinion of the Mercy of God to invincible Ignorance be true, this is Comfort to us, supposing we are mistaken, as it is
to

to you supposing you are so; and on the other side, if your Damning Doctrine be true, this is as dangerous to you as it is to us.

It lies therefore upon you even from the Opinion of your own Divines to be very impartial in examining the Grounds of your Religion; tho' indeed our Obligation to search after Truth does not arise chiefly from the danger of being mistaken, but from that desire that every good Man should have to please God, and to serve him as well as he can; and the want of this desire has more danger and malignity in it than a great many mistakes in Matters of meer Belief. To be only concerned to avoid those Errors that may Damn us, is the same undutiful Temper toward God, as it would be in a Son to have no concern to please his Father,

ther, but only so far as that he may not be dis-inherited. Many Errors that may not be fatal to Ignorant People, may yet be very dishonourable to God, bring a great Scandal to our Holy Religion, and do a great deal of mischief in the World; and these are things which a good Christian would have a great care of, tho' at the same time he might hope that God would pardon him, should he ignorantly fall into them.

This, I hope, may be sufficient to convince you, that you ought to examine well the Grounds you go upon in your Religion. I shall now endeavour to shew you some of the Errors which we charge upon your Church, and the Reasons why we Renounced them, and why we think it your Duty to do so too.

As

As to the particulars, I shall chiefly confine my self to those which the *present Act* mentions, those to be renounced in the *Test*, and in the *Oath of Supremacy*.

But before I proceed to them, I would speak a little to that which is the great ground and support of all your other Errors, the *Infallibility of your Church*; which if I can shew you to be a meer pretence without any Warrant or Authority from Jesus Christ, you will then more easily hearken to what can be said in the other Matters.

It cannot be expected that I should handle these Controversies in their full extent in the short compass which it's fit this present Address should have; but if you find what is said here to have
weight

weight in it, and that it gives you just cause of doubting, I hope you will be so kind to your selves as to come to some of our Divines who may inform you more fully, or to read some of those Books which have at large examined these Matters.

Infallibility is the thing in the World which a good Christian should have the least prejudice against; for tho' I do now believe, since I see plainly that God has appointed no *Infallible Judge*, that it is best all things considered that there should be none : Yet I must confess, were I to judge of things by my own Reason without any regard to what God has done, I should be apt to think such a Judge would be a great Blessing

C

About the
Infalibility of
the Church of
Rome.

sing to the World. I could not but be very glad to find an Infallible way to end Disputes among Christians; but Christianity has now been in the World near 1700 Years, and I do not know any Age in which there have not been great Contests and Disputes, except some few that were so stupidly Ignorant that Men hardly knew any thing of Religion, and then no wonder if there were not many Disputes; from whence, I cannot but conclude, that either it is the Will of God for wise Reasons, that Controversies should not be ended; or that an Infallible Judge cannot end them, or that there has all this while been no Infallible Judge.

But to consider this Matter more methodically; I have these *Two*, I think, strong *Reasons*, which make me conclude, there is no such Judge.

1. That

I. That you your selves are not agreed who he is. And

II. That the Reasons commonly brought to prove that there is, or ought to be such a one, do, if well weighed, rather prove against it.

I. That you your selves are not agreed who he is, and this is a mighty prejudice in a thing of this Consequence; certainly that which it appointed by God to end all Controversies, ought to be a thing out of Controversy it self. There ought to be a plain Commission, a plain Designation of the Person, or Persons, that Christians might know where to repair in their Difficulties. But is this Matter plain? Can you assign us any Man, or number of Men, that have, I won't say such a Commission,

but that in fact only have ever since the Apostles Days been repaired to by Christians, and looked upon as their Judge, and their Determinations thought to be Infallible? If you can, I for my part shall very thankfully submit, and own the Authority. But let us see what the People of your own Church say about it. You are sure that you have *Infallibility*, but you don't know where it is. Some say it is in the *Pope*, as Head of the Church, and Vicar of Jesus Christ; others say, it is in a *General Council*, but these differs. Some say, they are Infallible if Confirmed by the Pope; others, that their Determinations do not need his *Confirmation*. But besides these, there are others that say it is (they don't know how) in the *diffusive Body of the Church*.

Now

Now pray *Gentlemen*, does this sound like the Voice of Truth, or a Method appointed by God to end all *Controversies*? In Matters of smaller moment we allow Men to abound in their own Sense, and to differ from one another; at least we cannot conclude they are all in the wrong because they differ; but in this we may, and ought, because if there were any such thing as Infallibility in the Church, and that designed to be the Guide of all Christians, it could not be a Secret, or matter of Controversie where it was lodged; we should see the plain Appointment of God, or at least we should see in the History of the Church to whom Christians had appeal'd in all Ages. And for the Christian Church to be at uncertainty where to go for so long a time to end their Disputes; is the same sort of Absurdity that it

would be in a Nation for 1700 Years together not to know where to go for *Justice*.

But this Absurdity will appear the greater if *we consider* besides this, that tho' the Church of *Rome* be united together in a strong Bond of External Government and Polity, yet in truth and reality this Difference about the Guide of their Faith makes them *different Churches* and of *different Religions*. For a different Guide and Judge, if he be esteem'd Infallible, must make a different *Rule of Faith*; because his Determinations must be part of the Rule of Faith; and a different Rule of Faith must make a different Religion. To instance in particular, those that own *General Councils* to be Infallible, must take their Decrees as part of the *Rule of their Faith*; but now they that own

own the Pope for Infallible, must besides, take in all his solemn *Determinations*, and so have a much larger *Rule* of their *Faith* than the other, and in many Cases, very different, and what may be much more different than it is now; for if he be indeed Fallible, as many of them say that he is, he may determine *Vice* to be *Vertue*, and *Vertue* to be *Vice*, he may fall into great Errors, as other Fallible Men may do, and as some of them in fact have done; and yet those of that Church who own him to be Infallible, must take these things as part of the Rule of their Faith, and Manners.

These I take to be undeniable Consequences from the differences among them about their Infallible Judge; and I think, from all together, I may well infer, that

there is no such thing ; since it so much concerns the World, if there be any, to be at a certainty about it ; and yet the greatest part of Christians know nothing at all of the Matter ; and those who do pretend to know it are, in truth, as much at a loss about it as those that do not ; only they agree in a Name, which leads them different ways, perhaps all wrong, and only more *Infallibly* secures them in Error.

But I would now speak a word or two to the *several Pretences* to it. The *first Pretender* is the *Pope*, who seems indeed to have the best Pretence ; for if God do think fit to appoint such a one, a single Person who is always ready to hear and determine Matters, seems most proper, at least much more proper than a number of Men to be sent from all Parts of the
the

the World, who can seldom meet, and never without a great deal of trouble ; and this seems to be the most genuine Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* ; which makes the Pope the *Center of Unity*, makes Communion with him necessary, and a Mark of a *True Church*, and makes his Church the *Mother and Mistress* of all Churches ; which is hardly Sense without Infallibility, But as to his Presence, I shall consider it presently, when I come to examine his *Supremacy*, for if that fall, his Infallibility must fall along with it. One thing only I would observe here, That it seems apparent from hence that the Primitive Church knew nothing of his Infallibility, in that they took to that troublesome and chargeable and tedious way of ending their Disputes by *Councils* ; which, supposing he be appointed

by God to determine them, and in-
 abled to do it infallibly, were not
 only useless and impertinent, but
 indeed dangerous, and very apt to
 turn Men from the way by which
 God had appointed the Church
 to be Guided. A number of Men
 may be good for Counsel and As-
 sistance of one that is Fallible, but
 must be utterly unnecessary and
 an incumbrance to one that is In-
 fallible. And therefore since the
Church has always made use of *Coun-
 cils* either *General* or *Provincial*,
 to determine Matters of *Faith*, I
 may certainly conclude they knew
 nothing of his *Infallibility*.

Infallibili-
 ty of General
 Councils.

As to *General
 Councils*, it is not our
 present Business to en-
 quire of what *use* they
 may be to the Church, or what *Ex-
 ternal deference* is due to them if
 we

we could have those that are truly *General*; but whether they are *Infallible* or not? Now as to this, I would only propose this *one short Consideration*.

That they are not of the appointment of *Jesus Christ*, but begun 300 Years after *Christ* by *Constantine*; now whatever Wisdom there may have been in calling so many Bishops together to endeavour by their *Authority* to Compose the Differences of the *Church*, or to Establish good Discipline, yet it was still a Humane Constitution, and I know no way to annex *Infallibility* to what is so. If 3 or 400 Men meet together, each of which is confessedly *Fallible*, they must altogether be so, unless you can shew a Promise from *Jesus Christ* to secure them from *Error*: Now if there be such a Promise as
this.

this, we *Protestants* expect to find it in *Scripture*; but however, *you yourselves* cannot pretend to it unless it be in *Scripture*, or comes down to you by *Tradition* from *Christ* and his *Apostles*. As to *Scripture* the very Name and Thing of a *General Council* is quite unknown to it; and as for *Tradition*, that could as little convey down any such Promise, for the whole Thing was unknown in the *Church* for 300 Years, not so much as the Name ever heard of.

As for the Meeting at *Jerusalem*, of which we have an account in the 15 of the *Acts* of the *Apostles*, it was only a Meeting of those that were then at *Jerusalem* upon occasion of a Complaint that was brought to them; And it was a Meeting of Men, most of which were by immediate Inspiration singly *Infallible*; and therefore
can

can be no *President* for a Meeting of *Bishops* from all Parts of the World: And much less does this which was an accidental Meeting, contain an *Institution* for the future, and a Promise to make them *Infal-
lible* when met in a Body together, who singly are but like other Men.

If it be said, that they must be *Infal-
lible* because they represent the *Universal Church* which is *Infal-
lible*; the Difficulty will still return; for tho' we should grant the *Church* to be *Infal-
lible*, yet who appointed this *Repre-
sentations*? did *Jesus Christ*? Has he annexed a Promise of *Infal-
libility* to it? Without such a Promise as this, there may be *Infal-
libility* in the *Church*, and yet 3 or 400 *Bishops*, or the Majority of them may be mistaken, they may be a Number
of

of Men packed together to serve a *Turn*, they may be guided by Faction or Interest, by their own Interest, or the Interest of those who send them, as in fact it has been more than once; or if they are good Men, that will not make them *Infallible*. We may contrive as wisely as we please, but we can never be certain to annex the Supernatural Assistance of God to our own Schemes.

To conclude this Head, If the *Infallibility* you boast of be fixed in *General Councils*, there was none in the *Church* for 300 Years, when yet there was the most need of them, there having been a greater number of dangerous *Heresies* in that Time, than have been in the *Church* ever since. But what is worse, either there was no true *Faith* and *Religion* all that while,
or

orelse it must be granted, that we may have it without an *Infalible Guide*; *Christians* were then, at least in this respect, in the same Condition that *Protestants* are now; And I hope it will be granted, that we need not desire to be in a better than they were.

The *Last* refuge for *Infallibility*, is, that it is in the *diffusive Body of the Church*. But this I believe must be at last reduced to one or other of the former; for it will be very difficult to shew how the *Church* can exert it's *Infallibility* so as to be a Guide, but either by means of it's *Head* which you make the *Pope*, or else by the way of a *General Council*; there is no other way whereby those of *your Communion* can be certain what is the *Doctrine*, and what are the *Traditions of your Church* but one of these, and

and therefore having considered both of them already, I shall proceed to consider the way of Reasoning *your Divines* commonly make use of to prove that there either is, or ought to be such an *Infallible Judge*.

As for what they say from *Scripture*, it is commonly urged so coldly, and with so much diffidence, that we may see they do not lay any great stress upon it: But that you may not be amused only with some general Words in truth nothing to the purpose, I desire you would consider, that there being no *Infallibility* which can serve to be *your Guide* but only that of the *Pope*, or a *General Council*, nothing from *Scripture* can be pertinent, but that which proves either the one or the other. No Man, or Number of Men can be *Infallible* with-

without a particular Assistance, and we cannot be sure *they* are so without a particular Promise. And therefore when you hear any thing alledged from *Scripture*, only ask *your selves* What does this prove? Does it prove the *Pope* to be *Infal-
libile*? Or does it prove a *General Council* to be so? If it do not prove one of them, it proves nothing in this Matter, for you are never the nearer *your Guide* for any thing else.

Now as to *General Councils*, I have shewed already, that there is not the least hint of them in *Scripture*; and as for the Title of the *Pope* to it, I shall consider it presently in examining his *Supremacy*: And in the mean time shall take notice a little what they urge from *Reason* to prove that there ought to be such a *Judge*; ought to be
I

I say, for all the *Reason* in the World without a *Revelation* from God can never prove that there is one, it being a thing that depends meerly upon the appointment and good-pleasure of God.

The Writers of the *Romish Church*, it must be confessed, talk Plausibly enough when they expose the weakness of Human understanding, and the Infirmities of Human Nature; and I must say that in reading of them I could hardly forbear at least to wish, that if it had pleased God, some effectual Remedy had been provided to secure Men from Error. But this did not at all influence me to think that God had done so, and that upon these Three Accounts.

1. Because we see in fact, that neither Mankind in general, nor
Chri-

Christians in particular have been secured from Errors; that there have been as many Contests and Differences among Christians as we can suppose there would have been, taking it for granted that they were left in the State, we say they were, without any *Infalible Guide* to direct them; and therefore whatever force such a Consideration from the necessity of ending Controversies might have had in the first Times of our Religion; the matter of Fact does now in a great measure take it off; because in 1700 Years the *Church* has not been freed from them. From whence, as I said before, we may inferr, either that it is not the Will of God that Controversies should be ended, or that an *Infalible Judge* will not end them, or that there is no *Infalible Judge*; either of which, takes away the force of this Argument. 2. Be-

2. Because this whole way of Arguing from the weakness of our Understanding, and proneness to Error, and the like, proves nothing in particular, and consequently does not bring us at all nearer Satisfaction than we were before. The most natural *Inference* from it is, That every Man is to be of the Religion of his Country; for that makes through work, and excuses us from using our Fallible Reason at all in the Matter; whereas in *your Way*, however you may cry out of the uncertainty of our own Reason, yet you must use it in a great many material Points, and indeed, found all the certainty *you* have upon it; *you* must for instance, Judge by your own Reason, whether the *Christian Religion* be true, or not; whether among all the Professors of
Christi-

Christianity, *yours* be the *True Church*; whether there be any *Infallible Judge* or no, and who he is, and what his Determinations are. These are things of great weight, and of a great latitude, and indeed take in the chief Points of Religion, and yet these things must be judged of by that Reason which God has given every Man, or they cannot be judged of at all; whereas *your* whole way of Arguing from the fallibility of our Understanding, either proves that we cannot judge with certainty of these Matters, or it proves nothing.

3. This whole way of talking is to me a strong prejudice against what you would prove by it. For if you had a plain Institution or a Promise of such a Judge to shew, there would be no need of this Arguing

guing, that would be Sufficient; and without that, no Man can be *Infallible*; and we may be sure that Men have no such Commission or Promise to shew, when they are forced to use so much Cavilling and Dispute about the matter, which is indeed nothing to the purpose without the other.

We do with much more reason infer, that since God has not thought fit to give any such *Commission*, that therefore we must make the best of those other means which he is pleased to allow us; to *search the Scriptures*, and endeavour to understand them as well as we can. And this is the Method that our *Saviour* directed, *Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have Eternal Life, and they testifie of me.* From which Words, we may plainly infer these following things.

1. That

1. That the *Jews* had at that time no *Infallible Guide* in Matters of Religion ; for if they had our Saviour would have directed them thither, but we see he directs them to the *Scripture*.

2. We may inferr that the Persons our Saviour spoke to, had without an *Infallible Guide* sufficient Abilities to understand the *Scriptures*, and to have true *Faith* ; otherwise we may be sure he would not have sent them thither, and if they could understand the *Old Testament* without such a Guide, much more may Christians understand the *New* which is much easier.

3. We may inferr that Private Persons, (for such our Saviour spoke to,) may have sufficient assurance

surance of *Divine Truths* from examining the *Scriptures*, tho' they go against the Governors of the *Church*; for our Saviour tells them, that they might find in the *Scriptures*, that he was the *True Messias*, tho' the *Chief Priests* did at that time reject him, and were afterwards the Authors of his Crucifixion : All which do absolutely overthrow the necessity of an *Infallible Judge* in order to *True Faith*. And there cannot be one thing said against *Protestants* examining the *Scriptures* now; but what would have held as well, against the Command of our Saviour here to the *Jews*; unless they can shew us a positive Institution of an *Infallible Guide*; but all the Arguments from Reason, and the imperfection of our Understanding are perfectly the same in both Cases.

The

The truth is, all our Saviour's Preaching did suppose this, for it had been a vain thing to Preach to People who had not abilities to understand: And if we go further, to the Preaching of the Apostles, we shall find that they endeavoured to prove the truth of what they said out of the *Scriptures*, by which they appealed to the Understanding of their Hearers, and made them proper Judges of what they said, as far as their own Salvation was concerned in it. We see in *Acts* 17. 11. The *Bereans* were commended as more *noble than those of Thessalonica*, because they *searched the Scriptures daily to see whether the things the Apostles preached were so, or not.* The Apostle St. *John* commands Christians *to try the Spirits*; that is, to examine the pretences that any should make to the Spirit of God, which supposes

D

that

that their Understanding, how fallible soever, was sufficient to judge in these Matters.

In a word, the Writers and Emissaries of the Church of *Rome*, do themselves, when they don't think of it, in effect confess this; for when they bring *Scripture*, and other Arguments to persuade us to come over to *their Church*, I would ask them, are we proper Judges of these things, or are we not? Will our Faith be a true Faith, that is founded upon these *Scriptures*, or these Reasons that you here bring? If it be so, then we may understand for our selves, and there is no necessity in order to true Faith, of an *Infallible Judge*; but if it be not so, there ought to be then an end of Disputes; for it's in vain to Dispute, where it's supposed that we cannot understand or judge, and
all

all offering of *Scripture* or *Reason* to prove the truth of their Opinions is only affront and mockery.

But it may be it will be said, Don't we see People differ about the Interpretation of *Scripture*? some go one way and some another, and yet all are confident of their own; how can we be sure that we are in the right any more than they who are as confident in what they say as we are?

Now this Objection is founded upon this, that we cannot have certainty of what is once Disputed; which is contrary to the Common Opinion of Mankind, who would have done Disputing, if they thought they could not be certain when once Men differed from them. This does indeed overthrow all Reason and Religion. Some have

ventured to Dispute the *Being* of *God*, and many more the *Truth* of the *Christian Religion*; and yet I hope we may be very certain of the *Truth* of both these. But I would only urge at present this *one Consideration*. Are all the World agreed about their *Infallible Judge*? If not, how can they be certain of that? But to press this Matter a little more plainly; they say for instance, that we can't from Scripture be certain of the Divinity of our Saviour, because the *Socinian's* a small number of Men, dispute that Matter. But the same *Socinians* deny their *Infallible Judge*, and therefore that must at least be as uncertain as the other: And not only the *Socinians*, but all *Protestants* deny it, which must make it still more uncertain; and not only all the *Protestants*, but the *Greek, Armenian, Æthiopian Churches*, a vast

vast Body of Men, which must still add to the uncertainty ; and not only all these, but all that in any Age or Nation have ever differed from the Church of *Rome* ; for whoever differs from them must deny their *Infallibility* ; and consequently this must have been Disputed not only as much as any one Point, but as much as all the rest together.

This, I think, is a demonstrative Answer to this whole way of Arguing, and shews the manifest Absurdity of it ; for it makes things uncertain because they are Disputed, and yet makes the most Disputed thing in all the World the Foundation of all the certainty they have.

I have been the longer in examining this Point of the *Infallibility*.

of your Church, as being that which is the great support of all your other Errors.

I now proceed to speak something to the particulars I promised; and first I shall begin with *Transubstantiation*, which is the first thing Renounced in the *Test*.

The Sense of the Church of *England* in this Matter seems to be this; That tho' Believers in the faithful and due receiving of this Holy Sacrament are made Partakers of the *Benefits* of the Death of *Christ*, that is, of the breaking of his Body and the shedding his Blood, and so may be properly enough said to be partakers of his Body and Blood, yet that which they take into their Mouths is really but Bread and Wine; but Bread and Wine set apart for a holy Use,
to

to represent the breaking of the Body and the shedding of the Blood of our Blessed Saviour; and therefore in a *Sacramental sense* may be called his Body and Blood, tho' in *truth and reality* they are but Bread and Wine.

Both Sides do in some Sense own a *real Presence* of Christ in this Sacrament, but this one thing, if observed, will sufficiently shew the difference; That *Protestants* say, that in the devout and holy Use of this Sacrament, Christ will be present with his Grace and Assistance to the Souls of good People; but that the Things which appear before us, which we eat and drink, are not Christ, but Bread and Wine.

Those of the *Church of Rome* on the other side, say, That the Thing which lies before them,
D. 4 which

which they put into their Mouths, tho' before *Consecration* they are Bread and Wine, yet upon pronouncing those Words, *This is my Body*, and *this is my Blood*, they lose their own *Nature* and *Substance* of *Bread* and *Wine*, and become *very Christ*, the very same Christ that was Born of the Virgin *Mary*, and that suffered upon the Cross. And therefore pay them the same Divine Honour and Worship as if God or Christ did truly and openly appear before them.

Now the whole ground of this Dispute lies in the Words of the *Institution*, *This is my Body*, and *this is my Blood*. They say, that the Wordsought to be understood in the plain literal Sense; we say they ought to be understood as used by Christ in his Instituting a *Sacrament*, that is, appointing one thing
to

to be a *representation* and a *memorial* of another; and which because it does represent, may very well be called by the Name of that Thing which is represented by it, which we think to be a very natural, easy way of speaking, and agreeable as to that present occasion, so to other terms of Speech of the same nature which had been in use among those People to whom our Saviour spoke.

But in particular, the time in which our Saviour Instituted this Sacrament was when they had been eating the *Passover*; which was a Feast much of the same Nature among the *Jews* that this is among *Christians*; that was appointed by God in memory of their Deliverance when the Angel of God destroyed the *First-born* of all the *Egyptians*, and this in memory of

D 5

that

that much greater Blessing to Christians by the Death and Sufferings of Jesus Christ. As therefore the Master of the Family when he distributed the *Paschal Lamb*, was to say, *This is the Lord's Passover*, as being Instituted in memory of the Lord's *passing over* the Houses of the *Israelites*; so now being to Institute a new Sacrament for his Church of *Christians*, as that was for the *Jews*, he appoints a memorial of the breaking of his Body and the shedding of his Blood, and in the very same figure of Speech that the other was. *This is my Body*, or this is *the Lord's Body*, could be no strange form of Speech to them, who just before had heard him say, *This is the Lord's Passover*, and who had been constantly used to that form of Speech. And accordingly, we do not find that they were in any difficulty

ficulty or surprize in the Matter, which they could not have avoided if the Words are to be understood just as they sound; for it was a Matter more than a little amazing, especially to those who never had been used to such sort of Mysteries, that their Master should take a piece of Bread in his Hand, and with speaking a few Words, should make it become, without any apparent change, that very Body which was then standing before them. That he should hold his own Body whole and entire in his own Hand; that they should put the same *one* Body whole and entire into each of their Mouths, that they should *eat* him first, and *drink* him afterwards, and yet that he should stand by them *untouched* all the while; besides the very uncouthness and horror of the Institution, to eat their Master, a Person

son whom they loved, and had reason to love, and to drink Human Blood; these are things one would think, should at least, surprize them a little, and make them ask some Questions about it; for they are indeed strange, monstrous Absurdities; whereas the sense we give to the Words is natural and easy, especially to the Persons to whom they were spoken, as being used to such expressions, and who had heard the like but just before, in a like Case.

I have this one thing more to add in this Matter, That as the *Jewish* Sacraments were *Signs* and *Representations* as well as ours, and so were commonly called by the Name of what they represented; so the inward Blessings conveyed to them was the same that is conveyed by the Christian Sacraments; and therefore the Apostle tells us, they
did

did all eat of the same spiritual meat;
and drank of the same spiritual drink,
for they drank of that spiritual Rock
that followed them, and
that Rock was Christ.

1 Cor. 10.

3, 4.

Now here is altogether
as plain evidence that the *Jews* did
eat and drink Christ before he was
Born as the *Christians* do since: But
that is a way of *Transubstantiation*
which those of the Church of
Rome don't yet acknowledge; and
we may conclude, that if the A-
postle had known any thing of
that Doctrine among Christians he
would have been more wary in his
Expressions, and not have weak-
ned the credit of it by using the
same sort of Words where nothing
of the same thing was meant.

From hence we may give an
account of that large Discourse
of our Saviour in the Sixth Chap-
ter

ter of St. *John*, *My Flesh is Meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed*, &c. For if he were Meat and Drink to the *Jews* so long before he was born, he might in the same manner be Meat and Drink to them still without the portentous way of putting his Body into their Mouths.

Christ is said to be a *Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World*; and in the same sense was Meat and Drink to all good People from the Foundation of the World; that is, the benefits of his Death reach backward even to the beginning of the World though he were put to death several Thousand Years after. And they are the Benefits of his Death which are the great *Food of Souls*, that which gives, and preserves Life in them, as the Life of the Body
is

is kept up by Meat and Drink.

And this suggests *another Consideration*, That we may know what sort of eating this is, if we only consider what sort of *Life* is kept up by it. The eating and drinking of a *Body* is proper to keep up the *Life* of a *Body*, but it's only the inward Grace and Assistance of God that keeps up the *Life* of a *Soul* ; and therefore we then eat and drink for that, when we do by Faith or any other method take in that Spiritual nourishment.

In a Word, Our Saviour says, *He gave his flesh for the life of the World*, and we may then not improperly be said to eat his Flesh, when we receive in that Spiritual Life and Nourishment procured by it. And that this is the Sense is apparent

rent from several expressions in that Discourse, as in v. 35. *And Jesus saith unto them I am the Bread of Life, he that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst;* in which words there are Two things which directly contradict this gross sense of eating his very Body; First that he alters here the expression of Eating, and so explains himself, *whosoever comes to me, and whosoever believes in me,* which shews that this Blessing comes by *Believing* in Christ and not by gross carnal *Eating*. Secondly, The Blessing it self is such as does not belong to all that only externally receive the Sacrament but to such only as come to Christ with true Faith; as may be seen not only in this Verse but every where through that Discourse; thus v. 51. *If any man eat of this bread*

bread he shall live for ever. And v. 53. 54. Verily I say unto you, except ye eat the Flesh of he Son of Man and drink his Blood ye have no life in you, whosoever eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. Which words are very true if understood of the feeding our Souls by the Benefites received from the Body and Blood of Christ; but cannot be understood of external eating of him in the Sacrament; for very wicked Men often do that according to the Opinion of the *Romish Church*, and are only the worse instead of being the better for it.

This I believe is abundantly sufficient to shew that the Sense we put upon the Sacramental words, *This is my Body, &c.* is natural and easie, agreeable to
the

the design of a Sacrament, and other expressions of the same kind in Scripture ; and if it be so, we need not be solicitous to prove any thing more about it ; for there are so many Absurdities and gross Contradictions in the contrary Opinion that we ought to lay hold of any thing that can but make sense of the Words, and avoid those Monstrous Absurdities.

But I shall now endeavour to prove from the Words themselves, that the sense which the Church of *Rome* puts upon them, cannot be the true sense of them.

I. The Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* is, that our Saviour by pronouncing these words *this is my Body*, made that to be his Body

dy which before was only Bread; but certainly the literal sense of the words does not import any thing of this, and it's the literal sense which they must stick to, or else the whole support of their cause is gone; now according to all the Rules of speaking it ought to have been his Body before he could truly pronounce it to be so; but this they deny, and say it was only Bread till these words were pronounced, and that the calling it his Body made it become so; which is a form of Speech quite unknown to the World, and I challenge them to bring any Author either Sacred or Prophane that ever made use of words of this kind in such a Sense.

Since therefore it is confessed that what our Saviour took into his Hands was *Bread*, and that it remained

mained *Bread* till the speaking of these words, *This is my Body*, and since those words in their natural construction cannot be understood to effect any Change; it must remain *Bread* still; and be only the *Body of Christ* in such a sense as *Bread* may be called his *Body*, that is in such a sense as the *Lamb* they eat of but just before was called the *Passover*; by being a Representation and Commemoration of it.

2: Another Argument I would make use of is this, that our Saviour did not by pronouncing those words make what he gave them to be his very *Body* and *Blood*, because after the pronouncing of them, he calls what he gave in the *Cup* the *Fruit of the Vine*. *Verily I say unto you I will drink no more of the Fruit of the Vine*

Vine, until that day that I drink it new in the Kingdom of God ; In which words are contained these *three* , I think, plain *Reasons*, which prove, that it was *Wine* and not his *Blood* that he gave them.

1. That He expressly calls it the *fruit of the Vine*, and the Words, they say, are to be taken in the literal Sense, and literally nothing else is the fruit of the Vine but *Wine*, at least, the Blood of Christ is not.

2. In his saying that he would drink no *more* of it till he drank it new in the Kingdom of God, it is supposed that he had heretofore drank of what he then gave them. But I suppose, it will hardly be said, that he ever before drank his own Blood.

3. As

3. As the Words suppose that he had drank before of what he then gave them, so they do that he would drink of it again ; which very likely must be understood of his *eating and drinking with them after his Resurrection*, for then the Kingdom of God, that is, the new State of the Christian Church, was come. And therefore unless the Blood of Christ can be properly called the *fruit of the Vine*; unless it can be supposed that he had drank his own Blood before, and did design to drink it afterward, these Words must evince, that it was Wine which he then gave them.

I would not conceal that tho' St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark*, recite the Words which I have Quoted, after the Consecration of the Cup, yet one of the *Evangelists* St. *Luke* recites

recites them before, and so they may seem to relate to a Cup that went about the Table at the *Paschal Supper*. But this Objection, if well considered, does rather the more confirm what I have been proving; for two of the Evangelists do place it immediately after the Consecration and delivery of the *Sacramental Cup*, and in them it is apparent they can referr to nothing else but that. Now if our Opinion about this Sacrament, be true, the difference betwixt the Evangelists in this Case, is not material, as importing no difference at all in the Doctrine of the Sacrament, though our Saviour's Words are reported different ways, and so this secures the Honour and Authority of all the Evangelists. But if our Saviour's Words are to be understood, as the Church of *Rome* understands them,

them, it's impossible in any tolerable manner to reconcile the Evangelists; for St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark*, must, upon this supposition, not only put his Words wrong together, and out of that order he spoke them, but must also quite misrepresent his meaning, and that in a Point of great Consequence: Which, I believe, can be no way consistent with the Opinion which the Church of God has always had of these *Gospels*. But I shall consider this Matter a little more fully in that which I have to urge in the *Third Place*.

3. I desire it may be considered that the Words of our Saviour in the Institution of this Sacrament cannot be understood *literally*, because as they are recited by the Evangelists they are not *literally* the
the

the same, but differ as to the *literal* meaning very materially. St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark* in the Institution of the Cup recite our Saviour's Words thus, *This is my Blood of the New Testament which is shed for you*; St. *Luke* recites them thus, *This is the New Testament in my Blood*. Now from this difference among them, I would observe these *Two Things*.

Mat. 26. 28.

Mark 14. 24.

Luke 22. 20.

1. That the *Evangelists* being so little curious to recite the very same Words that our Saviour spake, could not have any Notion of a strict necessity of a literal meaning, and of such a strange Doctrine which could have no foundation but in the literal interpretation of the very Words that he spake; this had been at best very strange negligence in a

E

Mat-

74 *An Address to those*
Matter of so great Consequence.

2. I would observe that if our Interpretation of the Words be true, the *Evangelists* are easily reconciled, as agreeing in the same general Sense tho' differing in the Expressions; because both of them denote a Commemoration of the Blood of Christ, and of the *New Testament* or *Covenant* founded upon it; and it is not, then, very material which is placed first; but if they are to be taken *literally* it's impossible ever to make them agree; and so one of the *Evangelists* must not only have mis-recited our Saviour's Words; but quite have mis-understood his meaning, and have done what he could to lead People wrong in a great Point of Faith: For certainly the *true, real* Blood of Christ is a very different thing from the *New Covenant*
or

or *Testament* which is founded upon it.

But it will appear still of greater Consequence to keep to the very Words which Christ spake if the Opinion of the Church of Rome be true, that it is the repeating the Words of our Saviour which effects the Transubstantiation. For I would ask, Supposing a Man should Consecrate with the Words of St. Luke, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, would that change the Wine (not to say the Cup) into the very Blood of Christ? Certainly it would not do it by force of those Words, for they intimate no such thing; and it is not unlikely but those were the very Words our Saviour spake, for not only St. Luke uses them, but St. Paul, and that upon a solemn occasion when it concerned him much to give a true

Representation of this Sacrament; as you may see, 1 Cor. Chap. 11. The occasion of his mentioning the Institution of this Sacrament was very great Irreverence, which some were guilty of in receiving of it, indeed such, as it was almost impossible for them to be guilty of, had they believed what the Church of *Rome* now believes about it; it was therefore very necessary that the Apostle should speak clearly and plainly out *in this matter*; and we see he does solemnly usher in what he says with the Authority of Christ, *For I have received of the Lord, that which I also delivered unto you, in &c.* And then he repeats the Words as St. *Luke* does; and not only so, but calls the other part of the Sacrament *Bread* near Ten times in that Chapter.

4. The *Last Argument* I shall make use of upon this Head, is this, That the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* upon another account does not agree with the Words of our Blessed Saviour. The Opinion of that Church is, That under each *Species*, as they call it, whole *Christ* is contained, *Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity*; so that both are but just the very *same Thing*, in nothing different, but in outward *appearance*, which only deceives our Senses. And it is upon this Opinion chiefly, that they ground the denial of the *Cup* to the People; because, say they, should they have the *Cup*, they would have no more, but just the very same thing they had in the other Kind: And supposing their Opinion true, the Argument may, for any thing I know, have some force in it; but then they ought

not to deny us leave to Argue the other way ; That, that Opinion must needs be false, which makes our Saviour guilty of a great Absurdity in appointing *Two Kinds*, but both really the *same thing*, and one of them perfectly unnecessary.

But that which I would chiefly take notice of, is, That this Doctrine of theirs, contradicts the *Words* of our Saviour, for what they make but *One Thing* he plainly makes *Two*, and calls them by *Two* different Names. The one he calls his *Body*, the other he calls his *Blood*, which supposes them to be *Two* different Things, as plain as Words can express them.

They say indeed, That in the *Glorified Body of Christ*, the Body and Blood cannot be separated, and there-

therefore were the Words to be taken in such a sense as to consider them separated, they would contain a great Absurdity; so that wherever the one is, the other by *concomitancy* must be there too.

But who told them, that the *Glorified* Body of Christ is in the Sacrament? The Words of the Institution intimate no such thing, but speak of his Body *given* and his Blood *shed*, which certainly was *separate* from his Body. But however, this is arguing from Reason against the Words, and is just the very same thing which they condemn as *Heretical* in us; And if this be once allowed, they must throw off the whole Doctrine; for we can shew them Ten times as many Absurdities in the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, as they can in supposing the Body and Blood

80 *An Address to those*
of Christ to subsist separately.

In short, either we must stick to the very Words of our Blessed Saviour, or we must not; if we must, their Opinion must be false; which makes what our Saviour calls *Two* Things, to be but *One*; if we must not stick to the very Words, but interpret them according to right Reason and other Places of Scripture, they then give up their Cause.

To conclude this Head, What Reason can there be imagined why our Saviour should in a solemn manner, at different Times, and under different Names, give the very same thing? call the one his *Body*, and the other his *Blood*, when according to the Nature of the Thing he might as well have inverted the Names, and have called

of the Roman Communion. 86

called that his *Blood*, which he calls his *Body*, and so on the other side. There cannot, I believe, be any Reason thought of but only this, That the one Kind, the *Bread*, was very proper to represent the breaking of his Body; the other the *Wine*, to represent the shedding of his Blood; which is the very thing that we would have; for then there is a sufficient Reason for these Names without any *Bodily* Presence at all.

I have been the longer in considering the Sense of the *Scripture* in this Matter, because your Writers commonly boast more of the *Scripture* being for you in this Case, than in any other Controversies betwixt us: And, I think, I have proved more than I need have done, in proving that the Sense your Church puts upon the Words

of our Saviour, *cannot* be the true Sense of them : It being sufficient in a Matter of this Nature, which is loaded with so many Absurdities, to have shewed that they did *fairly* admit of another Interpretation.

But having so fully Confuted this Doctrine out of the Scriptures, I am now more at liberty to shew you the gross Absurdities and the monstrous Contradictions that are involved in it ; tho' in truth, it is so full fraught with Contradictions that it's a hard matter to know where to begin ; I shall therefore content my self just to repeat some of them which are ready Collected to my hand, by a Great Divine of our own.

Chilligworth,
p. 165.

' That there should
' be Accidents without a
' Sub-

‘ Subject, that is, That there should
‘ be, length and nothing long,
‘ breadth and nothing broad, thick-
‘ ness and nothing thick, whiteness
‘ and nothing white, roundness
‘ and nothing round, weight and
‘ nothing heavy, sweetness and
‘ nothing sweet, moisture and no-
‘ thing moist, fluidness and nothing
‘ flowing, many actions and no a-
‘ gent, many passions and no pa-
‘ tient, that is, that there should
‘ be a long, broad, thick, white,
‘ round, heavy sweet, moist, flow-
‘ ing, active, passive nothing.

‘ That Bread should be turned
‘ into the Substance of Christ, and
‘ yet not any thing of that Bread
‘ become any thing of Christ, nei-
‘ ther the Matter, nor the Form,
‘ nor the Accidents of Bread, be
‘ made either the Matter or the
‘ Form or the Accidents of Christ.

‘ That

‘ That Bread should be turned
‘ into nothing, and at the same
‘ time with the same Action be
‘ turned into Christ, and yet that
‘ Christ should not be nothing.

‘ That the same thing at the
‘ same time should have it’s just di-
‘ mensions, and just distance of it’s
‘ Parts one from another, and at
‘ the same time should not have it,
‘ but all its Parts together in the
‘ self-same Point.

‘ That the Body of Christ which
‘ is much greater should be con-
‘ tained wholly in that which is
‘ less, and that not once only, but
‘ as many times over as there are
‘ Points in the Bread and Wine.

‘ That the same thing at the
‘ same time should be wholly a-
‘ bove it self, and wholly below
‘ it self, within it self and without
‘ it

‘ it self, on the right Hand and on
‘ the left Hand, and round about it
‘ self,

‘ That the same thing at the
‘ same time should move to and
‘ from it self and lie still ; or that
‘ it should be carried from one
‘ place to another through the
‘ middle space, and yet not
‘ move.

‘ That to be One should be to
‘ be undivided from it self, and yet
‘ that one and the same thing
‘ should be divided from it self.

‘ That a finite thing may be in
‘ all Places at once.

‘ That there should be no cer-
‘ tainty in our Senses, and yet
‘ that we should know some things
‘ certainly, and know nothing
‘ [Cor-

‘ [Corporal] but by our Senses.

‘ That, that which is, and was
‘ long ago, should now begin to
‘ be. That the same thing should
‘ be before and after it self.

‘ That it should be possible that
‘ the same Man, for Example, You
‘ or I, may at the same time be a-
‘ wake at *London*, and not awake
‘ but asleep at *Rome* ; there run or
‘ walk, here not run or walk,
‘ but stand still, sit, or liedown ;
‘ there study or write, here
‘ do nothing but dine or sup ;
‘ there speak, here be silent ; that
‘ he may in one place freeze with
‘ cold, in another burn with heat ;
‘ that he may be drunk in one place,
‘ sober in another ; valiant in one
‘ place, a coward in another ; a
‘ Thief in one place, and honest
‘ in another ; that he may be a Pa-
‘ pist

‘pist and go to Mass in *Rome*, a
‘Protestant and go to Church in
‘*England*; that he may die in
‘*Rome*, and live in *England*; or
‘dying in both Places, may go to
‘Hell from *Rome*, and to Heaven
‘from *England*.

‘That the Body and Soul of
‘Christ should cease to be where
‘it was, and yet not go to ano-
‘ther place, nor be destroyed.

These are some of those mon-
strous Contradictions which are in-
volved in this Doctrine of *Tran-*
substantiation; I shall only observe
these few things more about this
Matter, and then conclude this
Point.

I. That you ought not for the
avoiding of these Difficulties to con-
tent your selves to believe in ge-
neral

neral that somehow or other, you don't know how, this Sacrament is the Body of Christ; for your Church has determined the Matter, that it is the very Body of Christ which was Born of the Virgin *Mary*, and was afterward Crucified, and that there remains no *substance* of Bread but only *this Body* of Christ after Consecration.

2. I would observe that none of these Difficulties are taken off by considering Christ's Body as *glorified*, for besides, that if it be a *Body* still, it must have the Properties of a Body, this Sacrament was Instituted while our Saviour lived in the World, and had just such a Body as other Men, of the same bigness, and all other qualities as to his Body the same. And therefore in interpreting these Words *This is my Body*, all the
Difficul-

Difficulties are still the same as if he were now living; or as they would be, were they spoken of the Body of any other Man.

3. I desire that you would consider, that you may be sure we do not mis-understand nor mis-represent your Opinion, because these Absurdities are what *your own Divines* take notice of, as well as *ours*, and do not pretend to be able to give any direct Answer to them.

4. I would observe, That tho' these Contradictions are so apparent and staring that no Body that hears of this Doctrine can well miss of them, yet they are new, and none of them ever heard of in the Church for many Hundred Years; from whence we infer, that the Doctrine it self was as little heard of.

5. We

5. We do not find that any Christian for many Hundred Years ever denied or disputed the truth of this Doctrine, from whence we cannot but conclude, that it was then unknown in the Church; for it must have had strange good fortune to escape without any Contradiction, when all the Articles of the Creed had been Disputed round.

6. As this was not disputed or denied by any Christians, so neither was it objected against the Christian Religion by any Heathen, not even by *Julian* himself, who, as being an *Apostate*, must have known all the Secrets of our Religion; whereas in truth, there had been Ten times more weight in this, than in all the Objections together which they made use of against Christianity.

7. There

7. There were several things in the Primitive Church inconsistent with the belief of this Doctrine, in particular that of mixing *Water* with the Wine, the Water to represent the *People*, as the Wine represented the Blood of Christ; of which St. *Cyprian* gives us a full Account.

Vid. *Cyp.*
Epist. 63.

8. I would observe, That the Church of *Rome* can assign no peculiar necessity, or usefulness of this Sacrament above others, that should give a probable Reason of the mighty difference betwixt this and others, and of such a strange wonderful Dispensation as the *eating our Blessed Saviour himself*: Nay, with them both *Baptism* and *Confession* are esteemed much more necessary, and the omission of them
much

more *dangerous* than the omission of this Sacrament.

9. To conclude this whole Matter, I think, I have sufficiently shewed that this Doctrine has no foundation in Scripture; I would have considered at large the Sense of the Primitive Church in it; and I do not question but to have been able very clearly to make out that it was a Doctrine quite unknown to the Church of God for many Ages; but that was not consistent with the Brevity I am at present forced to use; I would therefore only observe this one thing, That we ought not to conclude this to have been the Doctrine of the *Fathers* only from some *accidental* or *general Expressions* which they sometimes make use of; It's plain that none of them *designedly* treat of this Matter, or *explain* it to us,
none

none of them recite it among the *Articles of their Faith*, none of them take any notice of the *difficulties* of it, no Christians appear to have been *shocked* at this Doctrine, and no Heathens to have *Objected* it; all which could hardly have been avoided had this been the constant Doctrine of the *Catholick Church*.

And as for *General Expressions*, the calling what they received the *Body and Blood of Christ*, that could not be avoided, the *Nature of the thing* requiring them even according to *our Opinion* of this Matter: And we see that notwithstanding we have made such exprefs Declarations against the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, and that by reason of this Controversy we exprefs our selves more *cautiously*, than we may suppose the *Fathers* would do before any Controversy was moved

ved about it, yet some general Expressions of our *own Divines* are often turned against us by those of the Church of *Rome*, and there is no question but were the Authors of them as Old as the *Fathers*, they would be as confidently quoted for the Proof of *Transubstantiation* as any Sayings of the *Fathers*; now are.

And this shews us how this Doctrine, tho' monstrous in it self, might under the Covert of such *General Expressions*, without any great stir or bustle, *insensibly* creep into the Church, especially in very *Ignorant* and *Superstitious Times*; tho' after all, *our Divines* have sufficiently traced the footsteps of it, and shewed the progress it made, and the opposition it met with in the World before it could be *Established*.

The

The next thing to be spoken to is the *Idolatry of the Church of Rome. In the Sacrifice of the Mass, and in the Invocation of the Blessed Virgin, and of other Saints, as it is practised in that Church.*

Now Idolatry may be of *two sorts.*

I. When People worship any thing for the *Supreme God*, which really is not so.

II. When they give that *Worship* to any *Creature*, which is due only to *God*, and which he has *appropriated* to himself.

As to the first sort of *Idolatry* that of *Worshiping* some thing as the *Supreme God* which really is not so, we do not charge the *Church of Rome* with it, unless perhaps

haps the worshipping of what is but *Bread* and *Wine* in the Sacrament instead of *Jesus Christ* may come under that head; I say, *perhaps* here, because I would not enter into any thing, besides the main cause, that may be contested; for tho' *Jesus Christ* be *God*, and they worship some thing as *Jesus Christ* which is not so, yet the mistake being chiefly about his *Human Nature*, I would not positively affirm a thing which may bring on any dispute, which is not to our purpose.

This they do not deny, that they give the highest Divine Worship, which they call *Latria*, to that Object, which they take into their hands, and put into their Mouths in receiving this Sacrament; which I shall at present call *Idolatry*, but with a promise to recant

recant it whensoever they shall answer the Reasons I have given to prove that what they thus Adore is only *Bread and Wine*; or whenever they shall give me a more proper Name, by which I may call that great Sin of giving the *highest Divine Worship* to a *Creature*. The truth is, that such a Worship may not only be called *Idolatry*, but the most absurd and senseless *Idolatry*, that ever the World fell into: But this I shall not now insist upon, having spoken so much already to that which is the foundation of it, the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*.

The other Matter in which we charge them with *Idolatry*, is, the *Invocation* of the *Blessed Virgin*, and other *Saints*. Now in this we do not charge them with owning any of those to be *God*, but only with
F giving

giving them that Worship and Honour which cannot lawfully be given to any thing which is but a *Creature*. In speaking to this, I shall consider these *Two Things*.

1. Whether the giving to a *Creature* the Worship due only to God, may not be properly termed *Idolatry*, tho' at the same time we pay that Worship, we own it not to be *God*, but a *Creature*?

2. Whether the *Worship* given to *Saints* by the *Invocation* practised in the *Church* of *Rome*, be of that sort, such as God has appropriated to himself, and consequently such as becomes *Idolatrous* when applied to a *Creature*.

1. As to the first of these, Those of the *Roman Church* cannot deny but it must be a very great Sin to
give

give the *Worship* of God to *Creatures*; but they deny it to be properly *Idolatry*. We on the other side, grant, that it is not *Idolatry*, in the highest sense of the Word, and in the sense in which they commonly understand it, *viz.* The owning a Creature to be God. So that so far we are agreed; but then we say, that Word may be used in a lower sense, to denote what they grant to be a *Sin*, as well as we, but will not call it by that Name, so that our difference in this Matter, is only about the use of a Word.

Now we think our selves in the right in the use of this Word, upon these Accounts,

1. Because we have no other Name to express that which is not denied to be a very great Sin,

The giving *God's Worship* to *Creatures*; and having no peculiar Name for it, we think it not improper to give it the Name of that Sin which is of nearest *affinity* to it, and of the same *general kind*; as is done in many other Cases. Thus our Saviour calls looking upon a Woman to lust after her, by the name of *Adultery*, and the like. The next step to owning a *Creature to be God*, is to give it the *Worship* due to *God*, and therefore we think it not at all improper to call these two Sins by the same general Name, especially having no Word in our Language, more proper by which we may express it.

2. We think our selves fully justified in the expression, because the Scripture does every where charge the Heathen Worship of their *Gods* and *Images* in general, with

with the Crime of *Idolatry*; tho' nothing can be more apparent than that many of the Heathen owned only *one Supreme God*, and that all of them looked upon many of the *Gods* whom they Worshipped, not as *Supreme*, but as *Gods of an Inferior Nature*, and had much the same Opinion of them, as the *Romanists* have now of *Saints* and *Angels*, and had the very same pretences and excuses for the *Worshipping* of them which the *Romanists* make use of to defend themselves. They owned many of their *Gods* to have been *born*, and to have *died*, and it was hardly possible to look upon any such, to be the *Supreme God*. In a Word, There is nothing more evident than this, that they had several *Ranks*, and *Orders*, and *Degrees* among their *Gods*, and it was impossible to look upon all these to be *Supreme* :

And yet the Scripture every where without any distinction, charges their *whole Worship* with *Idolatry*; and so do the *Primitive Fathers*, as well as the Scriptures; particularly, they thought it to be *Idolatry* to throw a *little Incense* into the Fire before the *Statues* of their *Emperors*. From whence we may plainly inferr these Two Things;

First, That they thought that there might be *Idolatry* in giving such *Worship* as was *appropriated to God*, to *Creatures*, tho' they were not pretended to be any thing else but *Creatures*, only *Creatures* highly exalted, and in high Favour with God, as *Saints* and *Angels* are supposed to be.

Secondly, That they looked upon the offering of *Incense*, to be a part of *Worship appropriated to God*,
and

and that could not be given to a *Creature* without the *Crime of Idolatry*; which is a *Matter* the *Church of Rome* have reason to consider well of, who offer it every *Day* to those, who however they may have been better *Men*, are certainly no more *Gods* than the *Heathen Emperors* were.

To conclude this *Matter*, The sense of the *Primitive Church* in the business of *Idolatry*, is plainly seen in this, that they every where accuse the *Arians* of *Idolatry* for *Worshipping* of *Jesus Christ*, for this very Reason, because they owned him not to be *God*, or at least, not the *Supreme God*; from whence it plainly appears, that they had the same *Notions* in this *Case*, that we now have, That *Men* may be guilty of *Idolatry* in giving *Divine Worship* to what they believe is not *God*.

Thirdly, The *Apostle* calls *Covetousness Idolatry*; which, tho' it be a figurative Expression, yet however, denotes to us the thing for which I am now pleading. The Covetous Man does not look upon his *Money* to be his *God*, or intend to give it any of that *Worship* he thinks due to *God*; I believe no Covetous Man in the World can be justly charged with either of these; but because he places his *Heart* and his *Affections* upon it, which ought to be given to none but *God*; because his *Money* is the thing in which he puts his *trust* and his *confidence*, therefore it is, that he is said to make an *Idol* of it, and to be guilty of *Idolatry*: And so it is as to the *Worshipping* of *Saints*, tho' their *Worshippers* know very well that they are not *Gods*, yet because they give them

them the Worship of God, that outward *Adoration*, and inward *Reverence*, *hope*, *trust*, and *dependance* which are due only to God, they do by that make them *Idols*, and are justly chargeable with *Idolatry*.

I now proceed to the *Second Point*, To shew, that the Worship which the Church of *Rome* gives to the *Blessed Virgin*, and other *Saints*, by the *Invocation* practised among them, is *Divine Worship*, such as ought to be given to none but God.

We are not concern'd at present, to enquire into the *Doctrine* of the Church of *Rome*, but into the *Practice*; that being the thing particularly Censur'd in the *Test-Act*; tho' indeed, the *Practice* of any Church, is the best Exposition

of Her *Doctrine*. The *Council* of *Trent* leaves this Matter in general Terms, determines that we must

seek the help and aid of the Saints, but does
Opem Auxili-
umq; Scis. 25.

not fix the measures of it: However, since it does not Censure what was then the Common Practice of that Church, we may take it for granted, that the meaning of the *Council* was, that we must *seek their aid and help* in the *Methods* which were then in *use*; for if they disapproved of what was then commonly Practised, it concerned them much to speak out, as to set their own People right, and to keep them out of dangerous Practices; so also to vindicate the Honour of their Church, which was then openly charged with *Idolatry* upon account of those Practices.

We

We agree with the Church of *Rome* in this, That we ought to have a great *honour* and *respect* for the *Saints* of God. That we ought to *love* their Memory, to endeavour to imitate the good Examples they have left us, and to bless God for the Benefits he has bestowed upon the Church by their means.

And above *other Saints*, we ought to have a great esteem and value for the *Blessed Virgin*, who had the Honour to be the *Mother* of our *Lord*, and by that, to be so nearly concerned in the greatest Blessing that ever was bestowed upon the World,

But we differ from that Church in this, That they *Adore* the *Saints* and *Pray* to them; and that not as one *Friend* would desire another to *Pray* for him, but with all the
solemn

solemn Ceremonies and Circumstances of Prayer, and with the very same with which they pray to God; they do it in their Churches, Kneeling, and with their Eyes lift up to Heaven, and with all the signs of Devotion which can be shewed, not only from one Creature to another, but from a Creature to its Creator. They make Vows to them; burn Incense to their Images; dedicate themselves to their Service; make Offerings to them, and the like.

They pray to them directly to bestow Blessings upon them. Thus in the Office of the *Blessed Virgin*, She is not only called the *Gate of Heaven*, but she is intreated to *loose the bonds of the Guilty, to give light to the Blind, and to drive away our Evils, and to shew her self to be a Mother.* They pray

pray to her therein, for *Purity of Life*, and a *safe Conduct to Heaven*. She is commonly called the *Queen of Heaven*, the *Mother of Mercy*, and which is most Shameful of all, The *Psalms of David*, Composed for the *Honour of God*, and which contain the highest strains of *Devotion* which a *Creature* can give to *God*, are by a *Saint* of that Church turned to the Honour of *Bonaventura* the *Virgin*, by putting *her Name* where the Name of *God* is put by *David*: And this was neither Censured by the *Council of Trent*, nor has been by any *Pope*, that I can hear of, to this Day; but on the contrary, the Author of it has been *Canonized*, and the Book is in *Common use*, which perhaps, is one of the *blackest* pieces of *Idolatry* that ever was in the *VWorld*. And tho' a Church must not always

ways bear the Guilt of what is publish'd by private Persons in her Communion, tho' it do pass without Censure; Yet considering how careful that Church has been in many Matters of much less moment especially where her *own Authority* is concerned, and how solicitous they are to keep Books that make against them, out of the Hands of their People, it looks at least, like *espousing the Blasphemies*, and *Idolatrous Prayers and Praises* of it, to let this Book go so freely about without Censure, and to *incourage* it so far, as to make the *Author* of it a *Saint*.

These, and many other Instances, might be given of the *Worship* they give to the *Blessed Virgin*; and tho' they are somewhat more *modest*, with relation to other *Saints*; yet what I have taken

taken notice of already, may sufficiently shew, that they give them the VVorship which God has appropriated to himself. I would only therefore mention further, that in many Instances, they pray to them to bestow those Blessings which only God can give, such as to *open the Gates of Heaven, to untie the bonds of their Iniquity, to heal their spiritual Maladies*; and many other of the same Nature, of which, I shall give them Examples at large, if required, or, if I find it necessary to confirm any thing that I have now said.

I now proceed to take notice of some of those Reasons we have to prove, that this *Invocation* is part of that *Worship* which God has appropriated to himself, and which consequently cannot be given to any *Creature*, without the Crime of *Idolatry*.

1. I desire it may be considered, that the Scripture does every where speak of *Prayer* as applied to *God*, and to none else, and that without the least intimation of any such *Distinctions* as are made use of in the Church of *Rome*. VVe have in the *Old Testament*, the History of the Church of *God*, for near 4000 Years; and in all that time, there is not the least instance, or intimation, of any *Prayer* put up to any *Creature*.

It may be it will be said, That the *Saints* were not then in *Heaven*, and so were not in a condition to *hear* the *Prayers* that should be put up to them, and had not so much *Favour* with *God*, as they may be supposed to have now, since the *Resurrection of Christ*, that he has admitted them so nearly into his Presence.

Now

Now in Answer to this, I shall not at present, pretend to determine, whether the *Saints* of the *Old Testament* were in *Heaven* before *Christ's Resurrection*, or not; nor whether *they*, and other *Saints* since are there now; because a great many Christians of no mean Authority in the Church of God, have been of different Opinions in these Matters; only I think these two or three Things, are very plain.

I. That *Enoch* and *Elias* were supposed by a great many, before our Saviour's time, to be in *Heaven*; and they must have been looked upon by them, to be very great *Favourites* of *God*, by being taken out of this World in so strange and wonderful a manner, as the Scripture tells us they were; and yet we hear as little of *praying* to them,

them, as to any other Person.

2. Supposing it not agreed upon then, whether *Saints* were in *Heaven*, yet all agreed that the *Angels* were. And they were altogether as well capacitated to hear and answer Prayers, which should have been put up to them then, as they are *now*, and yet we find as little of Mens *praying* to *Angels*, as they did to *Saints* in those Times.

3. Whatever Reason can be assigned for *praying* to *Creatures* *now*, would have held as well *then*; whatever *necessity*, or *conveniency*, or *advantage*, or *fitness* there may be in it, were all the same, and indeed much greater then, than they are now, upon these Two Accounts,

1. Be-

1. Because the *Christian Religion* is of it self a State of much greater *Perfection* than any Dispensation that was before it. God has in it revealed himself more clearly and plainly to the World, has more evidenced his Love and Tenderness to Mankind, has given us greater encouragements to draw near to him; He speaks to us in the Gospel as a Father to his Children, as a *reconciled Father in Jesus Christ*; and therefore accordingly, in that Form of Prayer which our Saviour has left us, that is the Appellation which he has taught us to make use of, *Our Father which art in Heaven*; Now, why should a Child be afraid to approach the Presence of his Father? Or, what need has he of any body to introduce him? Under the *Jewish Dispensation*, when the Law was given with *Thunderings and Lightnings*, when
God

God was called by the terrible Name of the *Lord of Hosts*, there might be more reason to think of some body to introduce them to his Presence; which yet we do not find was ever recommended, or practised among them: How much more may Christians *come with boldness to the Throne of Mercy*, and expect to find *Grace to help in time of need*? But what is more considerable:

2. Christians have *Christ* for their Mediator, *who is able to save to the uttermost all those that come to God by him*; He is in Heaven ready to plead their cause, and to get their Prayers heard, and their Persons accepted; and they that have such an *Advocate*, need not fly to any else. But it was not so with the *Church* before *Christ*; and therefore if the thing had been at all lawful, they
had

had much more reason to make *Saints* and *Angels* their *Patrons*, than Christians have. And yet we see that in the Account which we have in the *Bible* of the Church of God before Christ for near 4000 Years, there is not the least hint of any thing of this kind.

3. What I have said already, that all along in the *Old Testament*, Prayer is appropriated to God, and that without any *reserve*, or *distinction*, may be sufficient to shew the Mind of God in that Case: But I have this further to add, That the same Scripture, adds with the same general words, condemn as *Idolatrous* all the *old Heathen Worship*: Now I have shewed before, that much of this *Worship* was paid to *Creatures*, under the same Notions and Apprehensions, that those of the Church of *Rome* Worship *Saints* and

and *Angels*; indeed there was this difference, that most of those Worshipped in the Church of *Rome*, were probably good *Creatures*, as most of those whom the *Heathens* Worshipped, were bad ones, and it may be *Devils*: But this distinction of good or bad *Creatures*, may make the Worship more or less *Impious*, but not more or less *Idolatrous*; whatever will make it *Idolatry* in the one Case, will make it so in the other. The Worship appropriated to *God*, is no more due to a good Creature, than it is to a bad one; since therefore I have shewed, that the Scripture every where condemns the Worship which the Heathen gave to what they owned not to be *God*, and which they did not intend to Worship as the Supreme *God*; I say, since this is condemned, not only as *Impious*, for choosing ill
Crea-

Creatures, but as Idolatrous for giving what belonged only to God: this must equally prove all Creature Worship to be Idolatrous.

4. This Creature Worship, is as little heard of in the *New Testament* as it is in the *Old*. Heard of, it is indeed, but what approbation it met with, we may see by considering these particulars.

The *first* Instance is that of the *Devil* desiring our *Saviour* to worship him, upon promise to give him *all the Kingdoms of the World*: But let us see what our *Saviour* answers; he does not put him off with telling him either the *Dignity* of his own Person, or the unsuitness of the thing, in Worshipping him because he was a *Devil*; but he gives such a Reason as will hold against all Worshipping of *Creatures*.

Thou

Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. From which words, I would observe these Two Things.

1. That the Worship which the *Devil* desires, and which our *Saviour* says must be given *only* to *God*, was not to *offer Sacrifice* to him, which the Writers of the Church of *Rome*, make the only outward Worship appropriated to *God*, but it was to *fall down* and *adore* him; from whence we may infer, that to *fall down* and *adore* any Creature, must be Idolatry, which part of Worship its apparent the Church of *Rome* give to their *Saints and Angels*.

2. I would observe here, that the *Devil* did not pretend to be the *Supreme God*, but plainly the contrary; for when he shews our
Saviour

Saviour all the Kingdoms of the World, he tells him, that all these things were *given* to him, *Luke. 4. 6.* in which he plainly professes, not a *Supreme*, But a *Delegated* Power; so that had not our Saviour in his Answer, condemned the Worship of *Creatures*, tho' *owned and acknowledged* to be *Creatures*, he had not given a full Answer to the Devil, for the *Devil* did not desire to be *Worshipped* as the *Supreme God*.

Another Instance we have of this kind, is that of *St. John* in the *Revelations* falling down to Worship the *Angel*, who we see puts him off it, with the same kind of general Words, that our Saviour uses in the former Instance, *See thou do it not, I am thy fellow servant, Worship God, Rev. 22. 18. 19.* Here I would observe, as in

G

the

the former Case, that the Worship which the Angel *rejects*, and *appropriates to God*, is falling down at his feet to Adore him. And in the next place, I would observe, that had Adoration been due to an Angel, the true Answer to St. *John* had been, that he should have a care not to mistake him to be *God*, who was but an *Angel*, and so give him more than was due to him; but we see he throws off the whole without any reserve or distinction, and for a Reason that will hold against all Creature Worship, that he was his *Fellow-servant*. In a word, it had been no great secret for the Angel to tell St. *John*, that *God* was to be *Worshipped*, or that *God only* was to be Worshipped with an *inward apprehension*, of his being *God*, neither of these were any great Mystery, or to the purpose.

And

And therefore his meaning must be, that Religious Worship, such as that Adoration was, ought to be given to none but God.

I shall name but one more place of Scripture, in which this *Creature Worship* is taken notice of, and that is *Coloss. 2. 18. Let no man beguile you of your reward by a voluntary humility, and Worshipping of Angels.* The Apostle in this, and the following Verses, makes use of Two Arguments against the Worshipping of Angels. First, that it is a *voluntary Humility*, that is, tho' Men may pretend a great deal of Humility, that it is not fit for such mean Creatures as they to go directly into the Presence of God, but that they ought to apply to the Angels of God to be their Introducers; yet all this, is Humility of their own inventing,

such as God has not required at their hands.

2. That this Worshipping of Angels, is *leaving Christ their Head*; He is the *only Mediator betwixt God and Men*, and therefore applying to any other, is leaving him who is the Head of the Church; and then no wonder if it *beguile us of our reward*. This Argument is very plain and very strong against the practice of Praying to *Saints* or *Angels*, and it hath this one thing very observable in it, That if this Text proves it unlawful to set up any more *Mediators* but *Jesus Christ*, it must be understood of *Mediators of Intercession*, for no body could so much as pretend, that *Angels* were *Mediators of Redemption*, as those of the Church of *Rome* (with-

(without any ground at all) make the distinction.

I might shew farther the *Idolatry* of this Practice, of praying to *Saints* and *Angels*, from this, that it must suppose *Divine Perfections* in the *Creatures* to whom we pray; as of *Power* to be able to supply our *Wants*, especially, in those Prayers that are put up to them directly to beg such, or such Blessings from them; and so of *Knowledge*, because Prayer (at least Mental Prayer) supposes that the Persons we pray to, know our Hearts, and the secret thoughts, and sincerity or insincerity of all the Men and Women in the World, and that they can perfectly attend to them all at the same time; which are Perfections that the Scripture never attributes to any but God, and in the Nature of the

G 3

thing,

thing, it is hardly conceivable of any Creature; but I shall content my self to have named these things, and shall conclude this whole Matter, with just proposing those two short Considerations.

1. I desire it may be considered, that in the Church of *Rome* there is no External part of Religion appropriated to God, and incommunicable to *Creatures*, but the Sacrifice of the *Mass*, and if in the preceding Discourses, I have overthrown the foundation of that, there is then nothing at all remaining.

2. I desire it may be considered, that the Reasons commonly given to justify Prayers to *Saints and Angels*, would, if well followed, hinder Men from ever praying to God at all, as in fact, this has
much

much estranged Men from God in those Countries where they have had no *Protestants* among them to make them ashamed of it; and even nearer our selves, I believe, we may justly say, that at least Ten Prayers are put up to Creatures for one that is put up to God.

Of the Pope's
Supremacy.

I now come to consider the *Oath of Supremacy*, which consists of Two Parts.

I. A *Declaration* of the Unlawfulness, and *Impiety* of taking up Arms against the *King* upon Account of His, being *Excommunicated*, or *Deprived* by the *Pope*.

II. A *Renunciation* of the Pope's pretended *Supremacy* over the Church of *Christ*, particularly over that part of it in this Kingdom. G 4 As

As to the *First of these*, I need not insist upon it; because if I can prove, the Second, *That the Pope has of right no Spiritual Power* here, the other must of course fall with it. I would only observe before I proceed, That if those of the *Roman Communion* among us, do believe, that the *Pope* has a Power from God to *Excommunicate*, and to *Deprive* Princes of their Kingdoms for *Heresy*, and that therefore they are bound to *concur* with the *Pope* as far they can, to put his Sentence in *Execution*, this must make them *Enemies* to all *Protestants*, and consequently, they have reason to expect that *Protestants* should have a care of them. But if they do believe that God has not given any such Power to the *Pope*, they have then Reason to have a care of their *Guide*, who is doing what he can, under pretence of Authority from God,

God, to carry them to *Treason* and *Murther*, and all the *Villanies* which must follow an attempt to turn out their *King*, and all his *Protestant Subjects* that will stand by him: But I have in some measure taken notice of these things already, and therefore shall not now enlarge upon them; but proceed to consider the Grounds of the Popes pretence to *Supremacy*.

The Opinion of the Church of *Rome*, with relation to his *Supremacy* is this, That *Jesus Christ* made *Saint Peter* the *Supreme Governor* and *Head*, as of all the rest of the *Apostles*, so also of the *whole Church*; That *St. Peter* was afterward *Bishop* of *Rome*, and that by Divine Appointment his *Successors the Bishops* of *Rome*, are to enjoy the same *Supremacy* over the *Church* which he had.

Their Opinion about the Supremacy of St. Peter, is founded chiefly upon those Words of our Saviour, *Mat. 16. 18, 19. Upon this Rock I will build my Church.— And I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.* They say, our Saviour does by these Words, promise to St. Peter, to make him *Monarch* of the whole Church: We say, that tho' these Words were spoken to St. Peter upon occasion of his speaking to our Saviour immediately before, yet, that this Promise does as much belong to the rest of the *Apostles*, as it does to *him*, and that therefore, whatever Power may be here promised to him over the *Church*, there is none promised over the rest of the *Apostles*, and that consequently, his *Successors* can claim nothing from hence
over

over the *Successors* of all the *Apostles*, the other *Bishops* of the *Christian Church*.

But to consider this Matter more particularly, we may take notice,

I. That the rest of the *Apostles* did not apprehend that *St. Peter* had here any peculiar Power promised him above them; for we find that not long after, they were contending, who should be the *greatest*; by which it's plain, they did not then apprehend that our Saviour had already determined the Matter: And as for our Saviour himself, he does not at all endeavour to put them right, as it was of great consequence he should do, supposing that he designed *St. Peter* for their *Governor*; but he endeavours to teach them all humility, and not to affect

fect Power or Authority over one another. And the same instance we have in the Case of *Zebedee's Children*, when their Mother came to desire that the *one might sit on his right hand and the other on his left in his Kingdom*, that is, that they might be the Persons of chief Favour, and Authority with him; their Petition plainly implies, that they knew nothing of *St. Peter's Prerogatives*; and our *Saviour's Answer*, which you may see at large, *Mat. 20.* implies as plainly, that neither *St. Peter*, nor any body else was to have such Power in the Church, as the *Bishops of Rome* have since pretended to.

2. I would observe, that these Words of our *Saviour* to *St. Peter*, do not actually invest him with any Power, but are only a *Promise* to
to

to him; and therefore the best way to see what was peculiar to him in it above the rest of the *Apostles*, will be to see the *fulfilling* of the *Promise*, and his being *Actually* invested in it. That this is only a *Promise* appears from the Words themselves, which run in the future tense, *I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*: And I believe, they of the Church of *Rome* will not deny this, because they say, that the *Apostles* were not *Priests* till our *Saviour* made them so in the Institution of the *Lord's Supper*. Now if we consider the *Actual Investiture* into this Power, there is nothing peculiar to *Saint Peter*. Our *Saviour* gives them all their Power together, in Words much of the same Nature with that *Promise* before to *St. Peter*; *Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose soever sins ye remit they are remitted, and whose*

whose soever sins ye retain they are retained. And as for the Expression, *Upon this Rock I will build my Church*, there is much the same said of all the *Apostles*. The Church is said to be *built upon the foundation of the Apostles, and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-stone.*

3. The best way to see whether *St. Peter* had any such *Supremacy*, will be to see whether he exercised any, whether he did any *Acts*, or *Offices* which belonged to so high a Power. There must be constantly so many occasions for the exercise of that Power, that if he had any such we could not miss of Instances of it. The Times of the Apostles were indeed, Times of greater *Simplicity*, than these later Ages; and therefore I do not expect

ped: they should shew me St. Peter Commanding after the manner of our *Modern Popes*: But if they can shew me any one single Act of *Authority* over the rest of the *Apostles*; if they can shew me St. Peter of himself, making Laws, and Orders for the good Government of the Church, or so much as *presiding* in the *College* of the *Apostles*; if they can shew me any *Appeals* made to him, or *Controversies* ended by him, or, among so many *Controversies* as happened, any advice to repair to him, or command to *obey* him; I shall not shut my Eyes against the discoveries. But to consider this Matter a little more particularly: As soon as our *Blessed Saviour* was *Ascended*, there was an occasion given to exercise this *Supremacy* in choosing a new *Apostle* in the room of *Judas*, *Acts* I. But we see that the method

method taken was, that the whole Multitude chose *Two*, and then they cast *Lots* which of the *Two* should be the *Apostle*. And so as to the choosing of *Deacons*, *Acts* 7. the whole Multitude chose them, and presented them, not to *Peter*, but to all the *Apostles* to be *Ordained*.

If we look a little further into the *Acts of the Apostles* to Ch. 8. We shall find the *Apostles* not sent by *St. Peter* up and down to their business as occasion required, but *St. John* and *him* sent by them to *Samaria*; which was not very *man-nerly* nor very *fit* had they known him to be their *Sovereign*.

Acts 11. we find those of the *Circumcision*, contending with him, and forcing him to give an account of his *Actions*, and that without any *Ceremony*, or *deference* proper
for

for one in so high a Place; and we see he patiently submits to it, without standing upon his Prerogative of being unaccountable, without chiding them for their Insolence, or any thing of that kind.

Acts 15. we find a solemn Meeting of the *Apostles* and *Brethren* at *Jerusalem*, where *St. Peter* speaks indeed, as any other Man might have done, but does not *preside* or *determine* any thing. The *Appeal* was to the *Apostles* and *Elders* at *Jerusalem*, not to *him* alone; and if any thing in the whole Meeting was done *Authoritatively* by any single Person, it was by *St. James*, for he passes Sentence, as you may see *Verse 19.*

If we go to the *Epistles*, we shall find as little evidence of his
Autho-

Authority, as we have in the *History of the Church in the Acts of the Apostles.*

The first *Epistle* is that to the *Romans*, not from St. *Peter*, but from St. *Paul*; where there is not the least notice taken either of St. *Peter*, or of the great *Prerogatives* of that *Church*, which, one would think, could hardly be avoided if St. *Paul* had known any thing of them; nay he says some things which directly contradict their Pretences, which you may see *Chap. 11.* He tells them there, that he speaks *to them who were Gentiles, as being the Apostle of the Gentiles*; and if so, St. *Peter* must not have had so near a relation to them, because he was the *Apostle of the Jews*. Then he proceeds to advise them to have a care of themselves, lest they should fall
away,

away, and be cut off; as you may see ver. 20, 21. *Be not high-minded, but fear, for if God spared not the natural Branches, take heed, lest he also spare not thee.* It's plain, that St. Paul at that time knew nothing of the great Privileges of that Church, of its being the *Mother and Mistress of all Churches*, of its being the *Center of Church Unity*, and of its being *Infallibly* secured from *Error* and *Apostacy*.

If we go on to the *Epistle to the Corinthians* we shall find there a very proper occasion to mention St. Peter's Authority, if he had any such as they boast of, as you may see 1 Eph. Chap. 1. *Now this I say that every one of you saith I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas [or Peter] and I of Christ; Is Christ divided, or was Paul Crucified for you? &c.* Those People certainly knew nothing of St.

St. Peter's *Supremacy*, nor St. Paul neither, otherwise he would hardly have omitted to tell them of such an *Infallible Cure* for their *Divisions*.

In the Epistle of St. Paul to the *Galatians* we have many Arguments against St. Peter's pretended *Supremacy*; St. Paul tells us there that he had no *Superior*, that he had his *Authority* from none but *Christ*, Ch. 1. 17. He compares himself with St. Peter, and says that the *Ministry of the Uncircumcision was committed to him as the Ministry of the Circumcision was unto Peter*, Ch. 2. v. 7. He mentions St. Peter as of the same *Authority* with *James and John*, when *James, Cephas and John who seemed to be Pillars*, Verse the 9th. And a little further he tells us how he openly withstood Peter to the

the Face, *because he was to be blamed.* All these things might be urged at large, but I content my self only to mention them. But from all together, I think, I may well conclude, that this *Promise* of our *Saviour* did not intend St. *Peter* any Power over the rest of the *Apostles*, and consequently, not any to his *Successors* (if he had any) over the *Bishops* of the Christian Church, who are *Successors* of ~~the~~ *Apostles* in general; tho' we do not deny, but St. *Peter* had a Power over the whole Church, but only as the rest of the *Apostles* had, whose *Care*, and consequently *Authority* was not confined to particular Churches, as it was thought fit in order to the better Government of the Church, that the Authority of *Bishops* should be since, but was left at large, and unconfin'd as to any certain limits either of Person, or Places.

But

But suppose it should be granted, that *St. Peter* had such Power, as they affirm he had, yet there is not one Word in *Scripture* about a *Successor*, or about the vast *Privileges* of the *Church of Rome* in this Point. And in truth, there is as little evidence in the *History* of the Church for many Ages, of this pretended Authority of the *Bishop of Rome*, as there is in the *Scriptures*.

Rome was at the time of the Planting the Christian Religion, a vast City, and the *Head* of a very great *Empire*: This must of it self, give the *Bishop* of it a great influence in the Affairs of the Church, which was almost all within the *Roman Empire*; this made all sort of Communication with him easy, by means of the mighty resort that was made from all Parts to the
Capi-

tal City; and Greatness of his See, did in course of Time bring great Riches to it, and if we add to this, that it was honoured by the *Preaching* and *Martyrdom* of two great Apostles, *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, we see plain Reasons why the Bishops of *Rome* were likely to make a great Figure in the Church; but as for *real Authority*, such as is now pretended, there do not appear any foot-steps of it for several Ages.

As for Speculative Opinions, We may not perhaps have so certain an account of them so long after, unless of those which by some accident or other came to be Disputed. But Government is a Practical thing, and there happens every day Occasion to exercise it, especially the Government of the *whole Church*; and if the *Pope* had been
from

from the beginning what he pretends to be, and what he now makes himself, his Power could have been no more a matter of Controversy, than it could be made a Controversy whether there were any *Christian Church*; for the same History that clears the one must at the same time clear the other.

The *Old Body* of History of the Christian Church is that of *Eusebius*, which contains an account of the Affairs of it for above 300 Years; now if the Pope were *Monarch* of the Church for those 300 Years, we can no more miss to see it in that History, than we can read any History of *England* for such a Number of Years, and be uncertain whether we had here any *King* or no, for so long a time : No History hardly can be conceived so faulty or imperfect, as to leave such a Mat-
ter

ter a Secret or uncertain; And yet I would Challenge any indifferent Person to read that *History* over, and to shew me but any one thing in it from which it can be probably inferred, that the Bishop of *Rome* was the *Governour* of the *whole Church*; whereas, were it truly so, there must have been something of it in almost every Page; Because all the business of the Church must in a manner roul upon him. He must be the Person appeal'd to in almost all Difficulties, we must have found his decrees in all the great Affaires that passed, His Decretal Epistles must have been interspersed up and down in the whole Work; his Authority must have put an end to all *Schisms* and *Heresies*, or at least their *Rebellion* against him must have been reckon'd as one great part of their Crime. In a word (as I said before) the thing must have appeared as plain as that

H there

there was any *King* in *England* for these last 300 Years.

Next to that *History*, the most likely place to find his *Authority*, if he had any, is in the Works of *St. Cyprian*, which contain more of the *Ancient Discipline* and *Government* of the Church, than is to be found in any other *Old Author*, especially, if we add further, that a great part of his Works is only *Letters* to, or from *Bishops of Rome*. We could not but see, in such a number of Letters, whether he wrote to his *Sovereign* or not; we should see it in the *Titles* which he gives him, in his *Style*, in the deference which he pays him. In short, the whole would some how or other shew that it was his *Superior* he was writing to, but now the contrary to this is true. He never speaks to him, or of him in his Letters to
other

other People, but by the Name of *Brother*; he freely Cenfures him and his Opinions, juft as he would do by any other Man, and with as little deference or refpect; and he finally differed from him in a Matter of great confequence, that of *Re-baptizing Hereticks*, and called *Councils* of the Clergy, and raifed a great Party againft him in it, and yet was never, that I have heard of, charged either with *Rebellion*, or *Schifm*, or *Herefy* upon that account; but is to this day reputed a *Saint* in *Heaven*. •

To conclude this Matter, The whole *Discipline* of the Ancient Universal Church, plainly fhews that the *Government* of it was an *Aristocracy*, efpecially, that ftrict Account that *Bifhops* were to give to their Fellow *Bifhops* up and down the World, of their *Ordi-*

nation, and their *Faith*, and other Matters in order to hold *Communion* with one another, which as it is left off since the *Pope's* Authority came up, so the use of it must have been inconsistent with it, for it was taking the *Judgment* of *Things* and *Persons* into their own Hands, which must not have belonged to them, but to the *Sovereign High Priest*.

In a word, their *forging* so many *Decretal Epistles* for the *Bishops of Rome* for so many *Ages*, is a plain Argument that they have no *true* Evidences of the exercise of such Authority in the *Ancient Church*, as is now pretended to. Had such Authority been then exercised they needed not have been put to the *forging* Evidences of it; we could not easily have miss'd of as many true *Decretal Epistles*, as we have
now

now *forged* ones, something or other we must at least, have heard of theirs, upon all the *Emergent Controversies* and *Difficulties* that happen'd in the Church: In short, We must have known of the Authority of the *Popes* of those Ages, by the same methods we know of the Authority of the then *Emperors*, by their *Actions*, by their *Laws*, by their *Rescripts*, by their *Bulls*, and by* the whole Course of their *Government*. And therefore we must not judge of a thing of that Nature, by some few *accidental* and *general* Expressions in Authors, or by *Compliments*, which the *Bishops* of so *great* a See could not easily miss of.

The *last Argument* I shall make use of is this, That it is not easily to be believed, that *Jesus Christ* has left such an Authority in his

H 3 Church

Church, without leaving at least, some Rules about it; such as *how*, and *by whom* the Person who is invested with it is to be *Chosen*, *how* his Authority is to be *executed*, and what are the *bounds* and *limits* of it, or whether it has any *bounds* or no: These are Matters of great consequence, which have been the occasion of a great many *Schisms*, and might have been, or may still be the occasion of a great many more; Besides, that so vast an *Office* without any set limits, is mighty apt to degenerate into *Tyranny*, and to betray Men into great *Exorbitancies*, to tempt them to leave the Simplicity of the Gospel, to Usurp upon the Rights of other People, and to affect at last, a *Secular Dominion* instead of a *Spiritual Office*.

In fact, the want of some such Rules to limit and confine his Authority has made great differences in
the

the Church of *Rome* about this Matter: *Some* say, he has a *plenitude* of Power; *others* say, that he is confined to the *Canons* of the Church; *some* say, that he is above a *General Council*, *others* deny it; *some* say, that he has the *Supreme Authority* over all the World, not only in *Spirituals*, but also in *Temporals*, that he has a Power to *Erect* Kingdoms, to *give away* Kingdoms, to *deprive* Princes of their Dominions, and to take away the Obligation of Subjects to their *Allegiance*; *others* there are, who either *qualify* this with *distinctions*, or else quite *deny* it; lastly, *some* there are who say, that he is *Infalible*, that what he *solemnly* determines ought to be a *Rule* and *Law* to all Christians, and to be taken as the Dictate of the *Holy Ghost* but *many* there are who *deny* this too; besides all which, there are

many Disputes about his Power of granting *Indulgencies*, his *dispensing* with *Oaths* and *Vows*, and with the *Laws* both of *God* and the *Church*. These are Differences of great moment, both with relation to *Faith* and *Practice*, and may carry Men as different ways as *Light* and *Darkness* are different, or as different as *Truth* is from the most monstrous *Heresies* in the World. Thus if the *Pope* be not above a *General Council*, he may carry those into a State of *Schism* and *Disobedience* who believe he is; if he cannot dispense with *Oaths* and *Laws*, and *Vows*, he may carry those into great *Sins* who believe he can; if he cannot *Depose Princes*, he may carry those into *Rebellion*, *Perjury*, *Murther*, and all sorts of *Villanies* who are led by him; and if he be not *Infallible*, as he pretends to be, God knows

knows whither he may carry those who follow him : And so on the other side, if he has all these *Privileges*, they are in as much danger who say, that he has not.

If Christ had thought fit to appoint a *Head* of his Church, I cannot imagine, but He would have given the Church some Rules about his Power, and the Obedience that was due to him : And I cannot but wonder how the same Church holds Persons that are of so contrary Opinions in Matters of this consequence : Let us only consider that single Point of the *Pope's Infallibility* ; I have already shewed that those who do believe it, must have a different *Rule of Faith* from those who do not, because his *Determinations* must be part of the *Rule* of their Faith, and consequently, they must have a different

rent *Religion*, from those who do not believe it. But that which I would insist upon at present, is this, That for a Person to affirm himself to be *Infallible*, and to be appointed by God for the *Supreme Guide* and *Conductor* of the Faith of Christians, so that whatsoever he shall *solemnly determine* must be believed true *without examining*; I say, for a Person to affirm this of himself, supposing it be false, is downright *Heresy*, and that as *gross* and *dangerous* Heresy as almost any Man can fall into: Now to illustrate this, I would only propose one thing; Suppose *Henry VIII.* instead of those other Matters in which he differed from the Church of *Rome*, had affirmed only this one Point; That God had made him *Infallible*, and appointed him to be the *Guide* of all Christians: Would this have made him a Heretick

tick, or would it not? There is no Question, but they must say, this would have made him and all his Followers so, or if there be any worse Name by which they could call them; for if he were in their Opinion, a Heretick for pretending to be the *Head* only of the *Church of England*, and that without *Infallibility*; How much more must the other have made him so? Now what is *Heresy* in *one*, must be *Heresy* in *every body*, supposing it *equally false*; for *Heresy* is not made so by *difference of Persons*, but by the *Nature of Things*. All therefore that believe the *Pope* not to be *Infallible*, must as much believe this Pretence to be *Heresy* in *him*, and his *followers*, as they would in the Case of *Henry VIII.* for the *Matter* is the same in both, and the Pretence supposed to be *equally false* in both, but must be
much

much more *dangerous* in the Pope, because more People are like to be *seduced* by him. That Reason which makes those of the *Roman Church* who deny his *Infallibility*, yet not speak, or think so severely of it, as they would do of the same Pretence in another Man, is really so far from excusing it, that it aggravates the Matter, and makes it worse and much more dangerous than it would be in any other : They do not speak out, because the Person who pretends to this Privilege, has great Authority among them, and is at the Head of their Church, whereas this is the very thing which makes such a Pretence the more pernicious, that he has great Authority even with the *whole Body* of that Church, and has a very great Number of them, who say, That if he determines *Vertue to be Vice, and Vice to be Ver-*

tue ;

ture; and the same, if he determines *Infidelity to be Faith*, yet he must be followed. God knows how many People such a one may carry with him into *Heresses*, or *Immoralities*, or even to *Hell* it self.

Perhaps they think that God will take care of his *Church*, and will not suffer any thing of that kind to happen; but sure they have little reason to expect such a miraculous care over them, who encourage the *Pope* and his *Followers* in such a *pestilent Heresy*, by living in Communion with him, and owning him for the Head of their Church. But besides, how do they mean that God will take care of his Church, when he has suffered a Person, whom they own to be the *Head* of it, to fall into such a dangerous Heresy?

Will

Will God preserve him, that he shall fall into no other Heresies? How do they know that, or how can they expect it? If any thing puts a Man out of the care and protection of God, certainly such a false pretence as that, is most likely to do it; And as for those who will stick by such a Person notwithstanding they see the falseness of his pretences, they have reason to expect, that God *should give them over to strong delusions*, rather than take any extraordinary care of them while they are in such a way.

I have now done with what I *at first proposed* to speak to, And I cannot but hope that I have said enough to give you just reason to comply with the Laws of your Country in these matters. This I am sure of, that I have
not

not willingly *misrepresented* any thing, or made use of any *reasoning* which did not first *convince* my self; If, in this short *Address*, I have not answered all the difficulties in these matters, or if you desire satisfaction in the other points of Controversy betwixt us and your Church, I must renew my request to you that you would consult some of our *Divines*, or read some of those *Books* which have been written upon the several *Subjects*, which I am perswaded, can hardly fail of *Convincing* you, if they are read impartially. As for *my self*, if I find by the success of this, that any thing I can do, may help forward your *Conversion*, I shall be very glad to take any further pains in it; And in the mean time shall not fail to put up my
Prayers

Prayers to Almighty God on your behalf, that he would be pleased to take away all Prejudice, to open your Eyes, and bring you to the knowledge of the Truth.

F I N I S.

ur
ed
to
ou